App. F. IX-4

1936-7 (G. G.)

File No. 39-36

Serial Nos. 1-12

*Previous References*

A No 360-24 (1-8)
G. F 46-20 (1-2)
G.F 70-18 (1-4)

*Letter References.*

G. G 56-35 (1-4) → G.G.55-39-1-2
G. G 50-36 (1-3)
G. G. 2-35 (12-15)
2-35 (16, 18-24, 27-36, 37-46)

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

G 29-37 (1, 3)
" 156-37 (1-4)
GG 28-37 (6, 9, 10)
GG 12-36 (1-2)

*Serial Nos.* Twelve.

GF 376-37 (164)

Gf. 98-40-1-2

**Part B for** June 37

GF 376-37 (1-2)

**SUBJECT.**

Report of enquiry into the Conduct of certain officials of the Gardens' Department in regard to certain irregularities brought to notice during the course of inspection

(D Note 1 dt 31-5-37)

To Deputy G.G.
Comptroller & Gen.

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—20-8-36

G. G 39-36-1

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSORE,

LAL-BAGH, BANGALORE.

*Dated* 21st December 1936
22

FROM K. Nanjappa, Esq.,
~~M. K. SITARAM CHETTY, Esq., B.A.~~,
Ag. ~~Offg~~ *Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore,*
*Bangalore.*

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

G.G/1113/21/12

Subject:- Suspension of one T.P.Arunachallum of this - Office Establishment.
-:0:-

Sir,

I have the honor to report for the kind approval of Government that one T.P.Arunachallum, Assistant Accountant of this Office and - doing the duties of Salesman, Lal Bagh Seed Depot, has failed in his duties to keep in safe custody the balance of stock of imported seeds entrusted to him in May last. As the said seeds are now missing and he has not furnished satisfactory explanation therefor I have placed him under suspension from today the 21st instant.

I am investigating the matter and a further report will be - submitted to Government in due course.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant,
22 December 36
Ag Superintendent
Government Gardens

1) Submit with a draft approving for the order
7/1/37

2) Is approval of Govt necessary? Please examine the point. What is the law on this official? by 9.1.37 by 2/1/37

3) Mr. Arunachalam is an Asst Accountant in the grade Rs 30-2-40. The suspension has taken place during the term of the Asst and not the permanent incumbent.

WD 0454—GPB—1,000

193

From

M. K. SITARAM CHETTY, ESQ., L.Ag.,
Offg. *Superintendent,*
*Government Gardens in Mysore,*
*Bangalore.*

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

Serial No.

The approval of Govt is perhaps sought for because it was during the period of the Asst Supdt and also during the inspection of the Office by the Chief Insp. Labs

Hy C.S. 12/11(37) 4) The fact that the present Supdt is holding the appointment in an officiating capacity cannot make any difference to his powers. Has he a Hd of a Dept got general power to suspend a subordinate official on Rs 80-2-100? Have the powers of the Supdt as Hd of the Dept been specifically restricted by a G.O.? please bring up.

Hy 13.1

5) It is submitted that as per G.O dated 7-10- certain powers delegated to Heads of Depts in view to decentralise, were also conferred under Memorandum to Labr. G.S. It was under this order also perhaps under Art 54 of the Mis. R that Mr. Knight was exercising the powers of obtaining transfer.

6) In 1925 when he was appointed as Dy of Mines the question of delegation of powers to Mr. Jameson who was appointed as Labr. G.S. was taken up and Govt directed in their order dated 10-9-2

3288

GG File No. 39 of 1936. | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

that
1) Mr. Jayaraya lie (prior hours of appointment on a pay of less than Rs 50/- abbreviations on Rs 50/- and above being reported to Govt for sanction

2) Mr. Hemmingford ~~was~~ on receipt was above as Director of Horticulture in which post he continued till the end of June 1931, when he was exercising the powers delegated to him in G.O dated 7-10-20 Mr. Jayaraya succeeded him as Supdt and has exercising the powers delegated to him as per G.O date 10-9-35

3) Third reference submitted to Paras 59-69 in the file A&G 360-36 (1-8) put up herewith, wherein it has been stated (Para 68) that No G.O is traceable defining the powers of appointing of Supdt - Govt sanction.

4) It is also submitted that Mr. Annadhalam has been doing the duties of Fakeman. Sole Offr Lal Bagh. the post of which carries a pay of Rs 55/- he has been ordered, vide G.O dated 25-7-36, to work on his own pay of Rs 40/- (in grade Rs 30-2-60 Govt Account

5) Remarks for orders.

6 C.S. 5/11/36)

7) Draft- consideration

Ch. Secy 6/11/36.

8)

The action taken by the Asst. Supdt. may be

Serial No.

approved in the circumstances reported.

(13) The General question of the power of the Suptdt. in regard to appointments, punishments including suspension and dismissals may be re-examined separately.

Dewan)

MS 22/1 Let 22.1.37

(14) MS 22-1-37

MS 25/1

(15) Issued Let. 25.1.37

DEWAN'S OFFICE 22 JAN. 1937 No. 2284

1937 CITY.

Letter No D 4874 dated 26-1-37 to the Suptdt. G. & Conveying Abstt. of Evidence to the Explanation of Mr. Arunachalam from 21-12-36 Memo No D 4875 dated 26-1-37 to the Complainant for information & forwarding copy of the letter for information.

Letter No D 1508 dated 21-1-37 from Suptdt-G. & forwarding the explanation of Mr. Arunachalam in the matter

(16) Submitted for orders

Sd/ C.S. 26/1/37

(17) The Ag. Suptdt has sent a strongly worded report against the

Serial No.

Salesman Arunachalam. It is however fairly evident from a perusal of the papers that several people are involved in the loss of the seeds from the depot. There is evidence that V. Ramachandra Rao as P. S Subrahmanyam had access to the depot and worked there for some days during the absence of Arunachalam on leave in August 36. Later, I. D. Kamarakaran was posted as Salesman and Arunachalam says that Kamarakaran continued to work in the depot even after his return from leave taking his orders directly from the Supt or Asst Supt.

18) It is admitted that the person who is responsible for the shortages noticed in the stock of old seeds in the depot is the previous salesman K. Subbarao. This official has come to Bangalore in August during the absence of Arunachalam in connection with the explanation he had to offer for the shortages. There is very strong circumstantial evidence that he had access to the papers

Serial No.

~~Clerk~~ in the Depot- and was responsible for bringing into existence the above-mentioned Stock book and the forged germination chart. According to the Ag Supdt the man who removed the old seeds from the depot and destroyed them is S. D. Karunakaran and it is this man who has written up the above-mentioned Stock book. The forged germination chart is in the hand writing of D. K. Ramachandra Rao who is the de facto Manager and Seed clerk of the depot.

19) Arunachalam says that- according to the work distribution memo the Salesman is in general charge of the Depot- while the Manager and Seed Clerk is in actual charge of the seeds and the registers connected therewith- and is required to furnish security. Besides the Salesman has the depot- cash in his custody and maintains the cash book.

20) In the circumstances indicated above it seems to me to be hardly just to punish a single individual before holding a thorough enquiry and fixing

WD 0417--GPB--30,000--8-9-36

Serial No.

the responsibility of the several people who contributed directly or indirectly to the suppression of the genuine stock registers and to the destruction of the old accounts. Such an enquiry has still to be held, and to punish Arunachalam at this stage, would be highly prejudicing the issue. I would therefore suggest that the new Supdt. may be asked to hold a searching enquiry and submit a detailed report to Govt and that in the meanwhile Arunachalam may be taken back to duty and the period of his suspension, treated as such leave as he is entitled to.

2) As regards the order placed by Mr Clarke for grafted mango plants it is difficult to understand how Arunachalam can be blamed for any irregularity which might have occurred in its execution. The rate paid to the contractor was fixed by the Supdt. and the payment was made to the contractor under the orders of the Supdt. As regards the dead plants there is nothing to show that

Serial No.

Mr. Clarke came on circuit some one & demands the replacement of the dead plants and that the contractor declined to do so.

2) Regarding the other charges mentioned in the Ag Supdt's letter it is sufficient to say that Arunachalam has not been called upon to answer them and his explanation has not been received.

For perusal and orders

Ch. Sec'y) 28.1.37

Please discuss with me.

31/1

Taken instructions.

2) Regarding the loss of seed in the depot. The enquiry held by the Ch. Sec'y recently also shows that a number of other persons are involved and that Arunachalam is not the most culpable of them. A detailed enquiry is necessary in order to fix the degree of responsibility of the various individuals concerned. It seems premature to punish Arunachalam at this stage. This will

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

3877
4049
4072

File No. of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

D. 5187
21.9.47. 3/0. 4
9. 5.2.37.

prejudice the enquiry. It has been ordered that Arunachalam shd get back to his permanent post as Asst Accountant pending the result of the enquiry he may perhaps be permitted to rejoin duty and to draw the allowances during the period of suspension treated as leave it as leave.

Regarding the other charges mentioned in the Ag Supt's letter and also in the linked file it will be seen that in every case Arunachalam has acted under the orders of his official superior viz the late Supt. Two things have to be proved before Arunachalam can be punished: It must be proved that an irregularity was committed in each of these cases; it must be further proved that Arunachalam instigated the late Supt to commit the irregularity that he advised or connived at its commission Now that Mr Seetharama Chetty has been compulsorily retired it may not be easy to prove these charges. It is for orders whether it is necessary to pursue the matter further

Ch. Secy
8.2

Serial No.

... OFFICE
No. 3293.

25 A fuller enquiry is necessary into the conduct of the following Officials before action can be taken against all or any of them.

(1) K. Subba Rao
(2) V. Ramachandra Rao
(3) T. P. Arunachellam
(4) I. D. Karunakaran
(5) J. Subramanyam
(6) K. Gundu Rao.

One particular act of his conduct deserves severe notice. This relates to the destruction of Seeds by the Seed room Staff after my Enquiry into the Conduct of Mr Subramanyam was commenced How this was brought about and which of the Officials actually took part in it requires be thoroughly investigated. Either the under Secretary (Mr K. Subba Rao) may hold an Enquiry into the matter or the present Offg Supdt may do so.

26) Meanwhile as it would not be fair & just Arunachellam alone, he may be allowed to rejoin his own post as Asstt Supdt pending the result of the Enquiry. I am afraid that all the first four Namely mentioned above are involved in this affair.

WD 0417—GPD—30,000—8-9-36

Dewan)

27 [illegible] 15/2

14.2.37

Suspension of J. P. Arunachalam

4072
4419

File No. G. G. 39 of 193 6 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No. 3470 25/2

28. Subst for orders writ a draft G.O.

29 The latest letter d 15.2.37 recd. from writ subject in regard to the subject is subst for perusal. This letter has been referred to in Draft G.O.

ks 18.2.37.

Ch. Secy 19.2.37

30 Please bring up. Would it not be better for the A/S to hold the Enquiry as the Offg Supdt. is still new to the work.?

MRS 20.2.37

31 Explained to the Ch. Secy by A 24.2.37

32 Draft for perusal before issue.

A 22.

MRS 24/2

Decision)

33 MS 25-2-37

MRS 26/2

34 Issued A 26.2.37

D 5836-7 dt 27.2.37.

Deputt G. G. i/c Comptroller to the effect that pending receipt of the report of Superintendent G.G. regarding the

4419. 5331. 5332

General and Revenue Secretariat | G.O. File No. 39. of 1937. | [App. F. III—2

| Serial No. | |
|---|---|
| | Conduct of certain officials involved in the shortage of seeds T.P ~~Arumachallam~~ Arumachallam be allowed to rejoin his post of Assistant Accountant, Govt Garden |
| 8-9 | Letter Dir Bs 31.3.37 from the Superintendent submitting ~~the~~ report on the result of his enquiry into the alleged shortage of seeds in the Seed Room, &c. |
| | 35 Subs with refce. to para 25. |
| | 36 The main charge against T.P. Arumachallam was that he failed in his duties in not carrying out the instructions of the Superintendent to keep in safe custody the balance of stocks of imported seeds entrusted to him. This question was gone into in detail by the present Superintendent and he holds that all the persons referred to in para 25 have had a hand in the affair and recommends the dismissal of Karunakaran and Ramachandra Rao as being responsible directly for the destruction or shortages of seeds |
| | The ~~recommendation~~ Joint- of K. Subba Rao an |

(Nos. 2 to 4)

[Karunakaran (Asian) is 39 years old and has put in 14 years' service. His pay is Rs. 40.]

[T. V. Ramachandra Rao (Rs.) is 41 years old and has also put in nearly 14 years' service. His pay is Rs. 35.]

He is reported to be a temporary official.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

GEN & REV SECRETARIAT
3 MAR 1937
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
Bs No 48/
3.3.37.

4419
5331-2

File No. 9.9 39 of 1936. | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

Annamalai Consisted in the re-writing of the Seed Register at the instance of Mr Sastri and incorrectly and his Superl. Characterises Subba Rao as "more a fool than a knave". The recommendation on behalf of these officials is that they may be transferred to some other departments or if retained here, they may be given less responsible positions. The Superl. has separately reported that the suspicion against Annamalai is in the transactions connected with the purchases of oranges &c. from one Mr Channappa and of Superl's of manures & Mr Clarke is not warranted and that he merely carried out the instructions of Mr Sastry. (1 to 3)

D. 5335-36

37 Govinda Rao is stated to be next in Service now and no action appears called for.

38. The only other person reported against by the Superl. is P. B. Subramaniam. The allegations against him are serious - The Superl. recommends his retirement from service. He completes his 50th year in July this year and has put in 25½ years of service.

1.4.37. Submitted for orders. L. Vide also letter no. D. 5633 58.

Serial No.

39 In this office letter Dt/27.2.37 the Supdt-A.G. was asked to hold a regular enquiry into the conduct of the following officials in regard to the loss of seeds in the ~~depot~~ Saleroom and other connected matters and submit a report of his findings for the orders of Govt

1) K. Seshaa Rao
2) V. Ramachandra Rao
3) T. P. Arunachalam
4) D. D. Karunakaran
5) P. B. Subrahmanyam
6) D. K. Gundu Rao.

It is reported that Gundu Rao is no longer in the service of the dept.

40 As regards Subrahmanyam, the Supdt says that he is a very mischievous man and a terror to the officials of the dept. He is said to be carrying on the business of selling seeds in the name of his nephew and there is a strong suspicion that much of the seeds pilfered from the sale room finds its way into his hands. The Supdt gives an instance of the sale of Vegetable seeds worth Rs 8/- to the Horticulturist

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—6-9-36

farm and the assessment of this amount against Kebrahmony and dues to the Farm. There are other allegations against him of the misuse of departmental labour and material. He is a permanent mason on Rs 60/- and his protem is Rs 70/- He is about 50 years old and has put in a service of about 26 years in the dept. The recommendation of the Supdt that he may be retired from service may perhaps be accepted.

41 The finding of the Supdt as regards Karunakaran is that it was he who surreptitiously removed the seeds from the salesroom and burnt them during the enquiry by the Ch. Secy. The substituted stock book is in his handwriting and the Supdt suspects that he was probably responsible for the suppression of the old stock register. He is said to be heavily involved in debts. He is the permanent plant & seeds Clerk on Rs 35/- p.m. In age he is about 41 years and has put in a service of nearly 14 years. The Supdt recommends that he may be dismissed from service

Serial No.

No Lighter punishment is perhaps possible in the circumstances.

42 As regards Narasimhaiya Rao's Superintendent's finding is that it was during the period that this official was in charge of the sale room as Planter Head clerk that the shortage of seeds worth about Rs 270/- occurred. It is probable that this official was in league with Subrahmanyam & supplying the latter with seeds removed from the sale room. It is reported that he has contracted heavy debts & that several attachment warrants are pending execution against him. As he does not hold any permanent post in Dept and the Superintendent's recommendation to terminate his services may perhaps be accepted.

43 The case against Subba Rao is pretty strong. It was during the period he was salesman that the shortage in the sale room occurred. When he was called upon to explain the shortage he and Kamma Karam stem & have joined

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

17

File No. 93.39 of 193 6. General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

and and manufactured a new stock book and suppressed the old one. The Supt. however states that he was more a fool than a knave. The reason for this opinion conclusion seems to be that Subba Rao was not in actual charge of the seeds and that he has to deal with such unscrupulous men as Ramachandra Rao and Kamesvaram who were plants and seed clerks during the period he was in charge of the Sale room. In his report of enquiry into certain allegations against M.r. Seshagiri Chetty the Ch. Secy has recorded his opinion that Subba Rao was a creature of M.r. Seshagiri Chetty. The Supt. does not recommend any punishment in his case apart from the recovery of the value (about Rs 230/-) of the seeds found short in the Sale room, but in view of his own findings against Subba Rao it seems to me that the latter deserves some more punishment. He is a permanent Supervisor on Rs 55 and is just over 40 years in age. I would recommend his reduction by Rs 10/- for a year or two

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 9939 of 193 6. | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

44 As regards Arunachalam the Supdt. says that he was the salesman at the time the seeds were removed from the sale room and destroyed and that had he been more vigilant and reliable the removal and destruction of the seeds might have been prevented. His Conduct in regard to the purchases of oranges and limes and the bouquets is also not above suspicion. The Supdt however is inclined to think that Arunachalam did not derive much personal benefit from these transactions and that he was one of those who played into the hands of M/s. Seetaram Chetty. ~~He strongly recommends his transfer~~ ~~In my opinion there is hardly any justification~~ ~~for such a recommendation~~ He recommends that the value of the seeds destroyed (about Rs 1000/-) be recovered from him and the latter transferred to a less responsible post. In view however of the Supdt's finding that it was Kamunakaran who removed and destroyed the seeds I think only a portion of the amount, say Rs 100/- may be order

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

19 Disciplinary action against certain officials in the Eyaraneo Dept. of 193 b.

File No. G.S 39 — General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

b be recovered from M/s. Arunachalam. In addition he may be reduced from Rs 40/- b Rs 35/- for a period of one year.

For orders

Ch. Secy 8.4.37

9. APR 193 GOVT. OF MYSORE. SECRETARY.

45 Please verify the findings of the Supdt. G.S. with the records of Enquiry into the cases. The records may be called for.

MR 11/4 by 13.4.37

TYPING 20 APR 1937 GENERAL DEPTT.

46 Asst. submits 18.16.4.37.

47 Issue by 16.4.37

10

Lr. - D 7084 dtd 4-37 Requests that connected records of enquiry may be submitted for perusal by Govt.

REV. DEPARTMENT 26 APR. 1937 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH 26.4.37

Letter no. D.O. 38 from Dr. Draesmans submitting the records of enquiry.

Letter no. Dy. S-8 1.5.37 from Dr. Draesmans submitting his opinion about C.B. Subramaniyam.

S 332
6044
6045

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. GS. 39 of 193 6 | [App. F. III—2

| Serial No. | |
|---|---|
| D.6045 | P. |
| D.6044 | Q. |

48 The present Supdt. has sent up some papers containing his statements of several delinquents and wishes us to state that his finding of misconduct is correct. Mr. Doraiswamy has made a special report against Mr Subramania and agrees with Mr Reddi that Subramaniyam should be retired for Service. The papers are submitted for orders.

18.4.5.37

Refer — para 45.

49 The record of enquiry is Class P. Item is the statement of the Record-keeper B.S. Rangadas that P.B. Subrahmanyam had surreptitiously removed for his personal file some papers relating to the H.B. Advance taken by him. The advance taken is only Rs 1400/- while the house is stated to be worth Rs 5000 to Rs 6000/-. The Supdt. suspects that Subrahmanyam must have unauthorisedly used departmental labour for constructing the house. Item 1 is the statement of the Farm Foreman Shamanna who says

WD 0417—GPB—30,000-8-9-36

Serial No.

that Subrahmanyam played an important part in the preparation of the false bill for the supply of gravel which was one of the charges framed against Mr. Seetharama Setti. There is documentary evidence that Subrahmanyam was carrying on and is even now carrying on a trade in seeds and the Supdt. strongly suspects that Subrahmanyam was responsible for much of the seeds stolen from the salesroom from time to time. The present Supdt. agrees with Mr. Reddy that it is very desirable that Subrahmanyam should be retired from service. He considers him both inefficient and dishonest vide his D.O. letter passed Q.

5° The statement of K. Venkata Reddy goes to show that it was D.D. Kurunakaran who removed the seeds from the godowns with the help of bogus devices and destroyed them on the eve of the inquiry by the Ch. Secy. Karunakaran admits that he wrote up the substituted Stock-book at the instance of K. Subbarao. Subbarao denies that he was responsible

Serial No.

for bringing the rice stock book into existence. But he admits that he has put his initials in the new book which had however, he attributes to compulsion. That the shortage occurred during his regime is also admitted and he has accepted liability for the same.

52 V. Ramachandra Rao was the plan and seed clerk during the period the shortage occurred. He alleges that he was never dealing with seeds at all and that his predecessor Kanna Karan did not give him charge of the seeds. The Supdt. characterises this statement of Ramachandra Rao as a deliberate lie and says that there is ample evidence that this official was given charge of the seeds and was actually handling them in the Sale room.

53 As regards P. Arunachalam, Venkata Reddy says that he was aware of the removal of the seeds from the saleroom and that he failed to prevent

WD 0417--GPB—30,000-8-9-36

23

Disciplinary action against certain Officials of the Gardens Dept.

File No. of 193 — General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

or report the matter to his official superiors.

Ch. Secy) 9.5.37

54/ have gone through the records in this case and agree with the Supdt. Govt. Gardens in regard to the conclusions arrived at by him touching the conduct of the Servant officials and Subordinates of the Gardens Deptt. My approved action as follows may be taken in respect of the officials referred to in para 39 supra

(1) K. Subbarao - to be reduced from Rs 55/- to Rs 40/- p.m. as suggested by the Under Secy. He should also make good the sum of Rs 270 or such other sum which actually represents the shortage in the accounts of the seed depot.

(2) V. Ramachandra Rao - He is heavily indebted and is unreliable. The remarks of the Under Secy in para 42 supra seem to be well founded. His services may be dispensed with.

(3) I. D. Karunakaran - may be dispensed with. He is an arch culprit. This man had the audacity to destroy seeds which by enquiry against Mr Subbaramaiah was in progress.

(4) T. P. Arunachalam - I agree with the

Unnecessary action against errant Officials 6044 6845 of the Gardens Dept.



Serial No.

5263

with the suggestion of the Undersecy that he should make good a part of the value of the seeds destroyed viz about Rs 400. Rs 100 out of Rs 400. But I would raise the amount to be levied from him to Rs 200. His Sta to be reduced by Rs 10/- for one year and posted to his respons Dept.

(5) P. B. Subramanyam. He may be Compulsorily retired as he was never cunning and some months he has 26 years of Service to his credit. He may b dealt with in the same way as his erstwhile Chief in Tuticorin chetty was dealt with.

7,562-3 C.S. 8-6-36-12-8 9-4-37.

Y. The words show how demoralised the Staff had become in the Lal Bagh and how Govt. property was being made a source of profit by the Smaller officials for the lack of honesty in heads of the department and total absence of check in the day to day execution of works. Such irregularities will repeat themselves unless the Supdt. exercises unremitting vigilance & checks not merely the accounts but the pa on which the accounts are based.

The punishments now proposed, will, I hope prove a sufficient deterrent to the erring officials in the Department.

Dewan

WD 6417—GPB—30,000—8-9-36

56 MS 24-5-37

MS 21.5

24.

MS 25/5 Govt 25-5.

6044, 6045

File No. G. G. 39 of 193 6

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

57. Submitted with a draft G.O.
16.26.5.37 58 Fair draft-
27.5.37

DEWAN'S OFFICE
28 MAY 37
No. 5365

5.9 Fair draft. Submitted
16.27.5.37 Ch. Secy 27.5.37
For perusal before issue.
28/5
Dewan)

CHIEF SECRETARY
27 MAY 1937
GOVT. OF MYSORE.

28-5-37
29.5.37
29.5.37

8 & 040-41 & 31-5-37 12

To submit G.O. Comptroller to Govt
Govt orders on the report of enquiry
into the Conduct of certain officials
... in the Case of alleged Mortgage
by Govt. in sale deeds.

DEVELOPMENT DEPT.
1-6-37

26

No. 1508
Enc. 3

13208

G.G.39-36-7

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTE
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSO
LAL-BAGH, BANGALOR

Dated 21-1-1937

347

GEN. & REV. BRANCH
22 JAN. 1937
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

FROM K.Nanjappa, Esq.
~~x M x K x SITARAM CHETTY x Esq x x x~~
Offg. *Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore,*
*Bangalore.*

SECRETARY. 21. JAN. 19 GOVT. OF MYSORE

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Subject:- Loss of Stock Book and Seeds etc.

Sir,

With further reference to this office letter No.1270 dated 22nd ultimo, I have the honor to state that the explanations furnished by T.P.Arunachallum are based on mere assumptions. Many of his statement besides being inconsistent, are quite uncalled for and absolutely - false as can be seen as under.-

1. When he took charge of the duties of Salesman in April 1936 he was fully aware that there were seeds and also the Stock Book in - the Sale Depot since a few weeks later he himself as per instructions of the undersigned, checked the seeds with the help of the said -- Stock Book, prepared a list of the balance of stock of seeds and a - statement showing shortages in them. After verifying the lists -- prepared by him he was strictly instructed to keep the book and the seeds carefully. When he was asked to explain why he disobeyed the orders in not carrying out the instructions, he deliberately makes a false statement by saying that he was not handed over the seeds by the then Salesman.

2. In his explanation he had stated that the Stock Book was in the Saleroom prior to his proceeding on leave on 7-8-1936 and that he could not hand over the charge of the Sale Depot to any one as he had taken in the first instance two days casual leave on account of - his ill-health and then due to the serious condition of his health he had to extend it by two months more, and thirdly during his absence

P.T.O.

certain officials of the office and garden whom he assumes to have beer xxx working in the Saleroom might have removed the book and other --- documents. This is again a downright lie since he had handed over his charge to his Assistant Gundu Rao when he went on leave and no one els other than the Saleroom people worked in the Saleroom. A few days afte he returned from the leave when the undersigned asked him for the book he had told that it was in the Saleroom and when he was asked to get i he said that it was with the Superintendent and that he refused to giv it. In this way instead of furnishing correct information for the -- points asked for he went on making incorrect and irrelevant allegation with a view to mislead the office and bring unmerited discredit on som of the senior officials of the Department.

Further he has stated that when he returned from leave he took charge of the Cash of the Sale Depot from V.Ramachandra Rao. This is of course true since V.Ramachandra Rao was asked to take over charge o the cash and Cash Book from Gundu Rao to whom Arunachallum had handed over charge of the Seed Depot as stated above. This arrangement had - to be done when the Assistant Comptroller Mr Y.Subrahmanyam had come here during his absence to investigate the transactions made xx --- in connection with the supply of garlands and bouquets to the Red Cro Society and other cases. Then as no abstract details for the cash - balance was worked out by Arunachallum, V.Ramachandra Rao was asked do it. However, Arunachallum cannot escape, his responsibility by - bringing V.Ramachandra Rao's name in this connection.

3. Further he has given grave occasion for suspecting against his honesty and capability in fulfilling the duties required of him as Salesman as can be seen from the following cases :-

(a) One Mr A.Clarke of Sivasamudram had placed an order in this office about the last week of April 1936 for 405 grafted Mango plants and as per his instructions the plants had to be sent to him by the 30th July 1936. While filling up this indent he has adopted the -- following procedure which leads to grave suspicion :-

P.T.O.

i. No indent as usual from the Saleroom was sent to the tendered contractor for the plants required.

ii. A cash bill was obtained from the tendered contractor on a - General Holiday - Sunday the 19th July 1936 - and the amount paid to him on the same day though there was no necessity or urgency to do so as - several of such bills relating to the supply made by him prior to this date were then pending payment. The fact of his taking a ~~cha~~ cash bill itself from the tendered and approved contractor leads to grave suspicio

iii. The tender for the supply of plants for 1936-37 had been called for and tenders had also been received by the 28th July 1936. Since the plants were got during the current year the claim of Messrs Puttanna and sons ought to have been settled according to new rates. Instead of -- waiting for a few days more to see the result of the new tenders he has hurried up the matter and paid according to last year's tender ~~xx~~ rates The current rates were very favourable and there would have been a -- savings of nearly Rs 53/- to Government.

iv. Mr Clarke was promised that the dead plants would be replaced but no agreement was obtained from the contractor to this effect.

v. This transaction was not at all brought to my notice though I was in the Headquarters during these dates.

(b) Garlands and Bouquets were supplied to the Red Cross Society on 22-6-1936 and two receipted bills were obtained from two individual parties on one and the same date, i.e. 22-6-1936 and payment made to them out of the Saleroom funds other than the imprest. Instead of -- writing in the Cash Book under "Particulars of Payment" the respective suppliers names he has stated as advance to flowers and charged off as regular payment under "Miscellaneous column" with a view to mislead th Auditors and checking officers. Till now the amount paid out of the - said Saleroom funds has not yet been recovered and adjusted.

(c) During the period of nine months he was in the Saleroom, he has not at all taken any pains to recover the outstandings by sending reminders though he was asked to do so several times. In this case, he has deliberately disobeyed the orders of the undersigned.

29

(d) Many of the bills for supplies rendered and many letters receiv from in and outside the State of nearly six months old were pending -- undisposed. They were all bundled together and thrown aside.

Regarding the destruction of seeds he states that I.D.Karunakaran appears to have removed the seeds and destroyed and that he had duly reported about this as soon as he came to know of this. Here also, he intentionally evaded to give out the truth. He never reported until - he was asked for in the middle of December 1936.

On enquiry and from the evidences gathered I find that I.D.Karunak Plant and Seed Clerk, removed the seeds on the 28th November 1936 and with the help of a cooly of the Saleroom burnt them subsequently. He is therefore solely responsible for the destruction of seeds but T.P.--- Arunachallum is also partly responsible in as much as he did not repor this matter to the undersigned in time, perhaps with a view to cover u the fault of his subordinate. The cost of the burnt seeds will have t be recovered by both T.P.Arunachallum and I.D.Karunakaran in the --- proportion of 1: 3.

In this connection I have to state that T.P.Arunachallum during t period of nine months he was in the Saleroom/has proved himself to be very unreliable and dishonest and in the office ~~as~~ his work as an --- Assistant Accountant/ and Nandi Hill Station Clerk, was in no way satisfac though he was fined on more than one occasion for having delayed month together in disposing of letters and cases referred to him. While -- I.D.Karunakaran who is equally bad, if not worse than him and who had also been fined for the neglect of his duties, had given room for -- temporary misappropriation while he was on duty at Dasara Exhibition - during 1934-35. I therefore submit that Government will kindly pass - such orders in the matter as they deem suitable in the circumstances stated above.

The explanations furnished by T.P.Arunachallum to Government ar herewith forwarded as desired by him.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant,

20.1

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

Street Sivanchetty Garden
Bangalore Cantonment
Dated 22nd December, 1936.

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Through

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lal-Bagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

I beg respectfully to bring to your kind notice that the Acting Superintendent, Government Gardens, Lalbagh, Bangalore, has placed me under suspension from 21-12-36 as per Office Order No.198 dated 21-12-36 issued to me, on the ground that I have failed in my duties to keep in safe custody the balance of stock of imported Seeds relating to the year 1935; copy enclosed for favour of kind perusal.

I beg to state that I have always discharged my duties to the entire satisfaction of my Official Superiors and to the best of my ability. I enclose herein a copy of my explanation given to the Acting Superintendent explaining several circumstances which show that I am not at fault for the said allegations, and I respectfully request you to kindly peruse the same and issue instructions to the Superintendent to cancel the order of suspension and reinstate me back to duty.

I beg to remain,
Sir
Your most obedient servant
T.V. Arunachalam
Assistant Accountant, Lalbagh.

forwarded to Superintendent, Govt. Gardens in his office letter No. 15
22.12.36
SUPERINTENDENT.
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSORE
22/12

M. K. SITARAM CHETTY,
L.Ag
Offg. Superintendent.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Govt. Gardens in Mysore,
Lal-Bagh, Bangalore S.India.

Dated 21st December 1936.

Office Order. No.198 D/21-12-36.

Mr. T.P. Arunachallam, Assistant Accountant, Lal-Bagh Office and doing the duties of Salesman, Lal-Bagh Sale Depot, has failed in his duties to keep in safe custody the balance of stock of Imported seeds entrusted to him in May last. Until he produces the said seeds or make good the cost of them, he has been placed under suspension from today the 21st instant.

Mr. K.V. Venkat Gowda, Supervisor, Nandi Hill Station, and doing the duties of Assistant Accountant, Lal-Bagh Office will attend to the duties of Salesman, Lal-Bagh Seed Depot during the period of suspension of T.P. Anunachallam or until further orders.

Mr. K.V.Venkat Gowda will take charge of the duties of Salesman in detail from T.P.Arunachallan and relieve the latter before this evening. (Sd) K. Nanjappa
Ag. Superintendent,

Government Gardens.

(Copy)

Bangalore Cantonment

Dated 22nd December, 1936.

To

The Superintendent,

Government Gardens,

Lalbagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to Office Order No.198 dated 21-12-36 ordering me to hand over charge of the Sale Depot to Mr. K.V. Venkata Gowda, I beg to state that I have duly handed over the charge yesterday evening.

In regard to the charge that I have failed in my duties to keep in safe custody the balance of stock of imported seeds entrusted to me in May last, I beg to submit the following, which explain clearly that I was in no way responsible for the safe custody and hence there is no failing in of my duties.

The seeds were not duly handed over to me by the then Salesman, Mr. K. Subba Rao in April 1936 when I took charge of the Sale Depot. Even Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao who was the Plant and Seed Clerk then and who handed over charge of the cash of the Sale Depot did not give charge of the seeds. According to the distribution of duties Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao. Plant and Seed Clerk, who was responsible for the safe custody of Seeds should have handed over the entire charge to me when he was taken back to work in the Office, but he has failed to do this. This matter was reported to the Assistant Superintendent and Superintendent, who did not take any action in the matte In place of Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao, taken away to Office

A few weeks after I took charge as Salesman the Assistant Superintendent came to the Sale Depot and checked the stock of seeds and the stock verification disclosed shortages in several varieties, as already reported by me. The statement of shortage of Seeds was not first accepted by the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent. Mr. K. Subba Rao, my predecessor was directed to explain in this matter, and he did not submit his explanations till the end of November 1936 when he reported that certain documents relating to the above were handed over to Mr. I. D. Karunakaran, who was posted to the Sale Depot during my absence on leave, to look after my duties. I fell ill and was forced to proceed on leave from 7th to 23rd August 1936. Mr. K. Subba Rao was also here from 20-8-36. He and I.D. Karunakaran managed to substitute a new stock book of Seeds and a germination chart during my absence. The above manipulations were brought to light when the explanations of Mr. K. Subba Rao and I. D. Karunakaran were called for during the last month.

In the light of the above facts I beg to submit : -

(a) That no failing in duty for the safe custody of Seeds can be inflicted upon me as I have duly brought to the notice of my Official Superiors the following facts :

(1) The shortage in seeds when I took charge of the post of Salesman from Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao.

(2) In fact the Plant and Seed Clerk (Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao) was posted elsewhere to work and want of suitable responsible Official to work as Plant and Seed Clerk attending to the safeguard of Seeds etc.

(3) The posting of Mr. I.D. Karunakaran in the Sale Depot led to the subsequent manipulation of records

(4) In obedience to Memo No. 176 dated 14-12-36 the

the explanations of the Officials working in the Sale Room (Messrs. D.K. Gundu Rao, K. Venkata Reddy were obtained and duly submitted by me in the matter of the balance of Seeds and no action has been taken to mark the Official concerned who is responsible for the removal of Seeds, in question.

In conclusion I beg to state that I have been discharging my duties to the best of my ability and I have now and then pointed out the several shortcomings and impedements in the management of Sale Room, but in vain.

Evidently the following Officials are responsible for the several discrepancies noted against each in the matter of the safety of the Seeds.

1) Mr. K. Subba Rao : He did not hand over the charge of the Sale Depot in detail. He has created a new Stock Book with the assistance of I.D. Karunakaran during my absence. He was primarily responsible for not furnishing detailed explanation regarding the shortage of Seeds and in delaying till last month the submission of his explanations. On enquiry he has directed the Plant and Seed Clerk, I.D. Karunakaran, to destroy the Seeds (vide remarks made by him in the germination chart and the substituted Stock Book where entries are made in his own hand-writing.

2) Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao : He has been working as Plant and Seed Clerk when I took charge in April 1936 and was entrusted with the Seeds in question (vide the documents already furnished in support of this and later marked as exhibits during the enquiry). He has failed to hand over the entire charge of the Seeds to me when he was taken to

the office. He denied that he was ~~xx~~ in charge of the Seeds, though he was actually issuing the Seeds.

3) Mr. I.D. Karunakaran : He was posted to work in the Sale Depot during my absence in August 1936. He and Mr. K. Subba Rao who was then at Headquarters joined together and made a substituted Stock and initialled in each page. He has also recorded in that above book that the balance of Seeds have been destroyed as per orders. During the last month Mr. I.D. Karunakaran has removed the Seeds in question and destroyed them as is evident from the statement of the Sale Room Officials, Mr. D.K. Gundu Rao and Venkata Reddy & Dewan. This was submitted to the Assistant Superintendent and no further enquiry seems to have been conducted.

4) Mr. D.K. Gundu Rao : During the enquiry it is found that he has helped Mr. K. Subba Rao in preparing a false germination chart wherein it is enumerated that the Seeds have been destroyed. He has also submitted that the seeds were removed by Mr. I.D. Karunakaran during the last ~~week~~ month.

In the above circumstances, I respectfully beg to point out that I have not failed in my duties to keep in safe custody the balance of stock of imported Seeds and it is also clear that in the interest of work I have been reporting all shortcomings in time to the superior Officers for needful action and I humbly pray that my explanations may kindly be accepted and I may be ordered to rejoin duty.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

T.P. Arunachalam

No.2, IV Street, Sivanchetty Garden,
Bangalore Cantonment,
Dated 25th December, 1936.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
B a n g a l o r e.

Through

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lal-Bagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter dated 22nd instant I beg respectfully to enclose Memo No.1305 dated 23-12-36 received from the Acting Superintendent, Government Gardens Lal-Bagh, Bangalore, directing me to furnish clear and correct explanations on the points enumerated therein.

I enclose herein a copy of my explanation in the above matter which shows that I am not at fault for the allegations, and I respectfully request your goodself to kindly peruse the same and issue instructions to the Acting Superintende to cancel the order of suspension in the light of the above facts and take me back to duty.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
T. P. Annachalam.

as enclosure.
wanted to open book-to
T.G. Sec'l No. 1608 A-21/37.

R. Ramyappa 21.1.37
SUPERINTENDENT.
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSORE.
21/1

Government Gardens Department.

M e m o. No.1305 D/23-12-36.

His explanation dated 23nd instant regarding - the missing seeds.

-:0:-

With reference to the above, Mr. T.P. Arunachallum is informed that the explanation furnished by him regarding the above subject is quite inconsistent and many of his statements are quite un-called for. He is, therefore, required to furnish his clear and correct explanations for the following :-

1. In May last, the stock of imported seeds were checked by the Assistant Superintendent, shortages verified and the balance of stock on hand with the stock book was entrusted to him.
What became of these?

2. On the 28th November 1936 it is understood that the said seeds were removed by his Assistant from the Sale Room and destroyed. If so, why did he not as Salesman of the Seed Depot submit a report to this effect to the undersigned immediately.

Sd. K. Nanjappa
Ag.Superintendent
Government Gardens

To

Mr. T.P. Arunachallum,
No.2, Fourth Street,
Sivanchetty Gardens,
C.& M.Station, BANGALORE.

(True Copy)

25/12/36.

38

No.2, IV Street, Sivanchetty Garden,
Bangalore Cantonment,
Dated 25th December, 1936.

To

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lal-Bagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to Office Memo No.1305 dated 23-12-36 regarding my explanation dated 22-12-36, I beg to state as follows: -

1) With reference to para 1 of Memo, I beg to submit that the particulars of information furnished in my letter of the 22nd instant were in my humble opinion necessary to deal with the merits of the case, and to show clearly that I was not at fault for the said allegations referred to in the Office Order No.198 dated 21-12-36. If for any reason you consider that they were quite inconsistent and uncalled for, I pray that I may kindly be excused for the same.

2) As regards the clear and correct explanations required from me on the points 1 and 2, I submit the following in their relative order: -

a) In inviting your kind attention to para 1 of page 2 of my explanation dated 22nd instant, I beg to submit that on my oral report to the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent regarding the shortages of Seeds in the stock of 1935 (soon after Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao, Plant & Seed Clerk was removed to the Office without handing over the charge of Seeds in detail) the Assistant Superintendent came to the Sale Depot and checked only a few items of Seed stock ~~only~~ and noticed shortages in them and subsequently issued a memo to the undersigned for completing the stock verification. Accordingly submitted the result of such verification stating that the Salesman (Mr. K. Subba—Rao) in general and the Plant & Seed Clerk (Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao) in particular were

were responsible to account for the stock of imported Seeds. Mr.K. Subba Rao was directed to explain for the shortage while Mr.V. Ramachandra Rao was not at all enquired into the matter.

Had the shortages been duly accounted for by the above Officials and the balance duly handed over to me, the responsibility for safeguarding the balance of stock would certainly devolve on me if the same could not be entrusted to the plant and seed clerk whose legitimate duty it is to safeguard and deal with it.

Hence, it is clear that the accounting for the shortages was not completed and therefore the handing over of the balance of stock of Seeds did not at all arise until the end of November 1936 when a substituted stock book and a germination chart produced by Mr. I.D. Karunakaran (who happened to be the Salesman during my absence on leave and continued as such even after my return to duty till date) disclosed that the Seeds under advertence were destroyed without my knowledge, vide entries made by him in the substituted stock book.

As regards the old stock book, I beg to submit that it was in the Sale Depot when I proceeded on leave from 7-8-36. During my absence the following officials have been working in the Sale Depot.

1. Mr. P.B. Subramaniam
2. " V. Ramachandra Rao
3. " I.D. Karunakaran
4. " K. Subba Rao

Apart from the above Mr. Raghavendra Rao the Office Manager and Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao appear to have removed several documents such as Registers, Vouchers, Files etc. kept in the Sale Room in safe custody without the permission of the Superintendent as evident from the Memo issued to the Manager by the Superintendent asking for an explanation for the said action.

Whether all such documents removed during my absence were duly returned to the Sale Room is not clear as no inventory was made for such records removed by the above officials. A detailed report in this matter has been submitted to the Superintendent immediately after I joined duty on the expiry of leave. (Vide Mr. K. Venkata Reddy's statement submitted to the Superintendent).

I, therefore, humbly submit that the stock book in question should have been removed then and substituted by a new one which discloses at any rate that Messrs. K. Subba Rao and I.D. Karunakaran are the persons responsible for its creation. Further, Mr.K.Subba Rao had a free hand with all the documents in the Sale Depot when he was called to Headquarters to settle all pending matters including the Seed question and Audit Report. Mr. I.D.Karunakaran who was posted during my absence to the Sale Depot and who continued to be in the Sale Room even after my return to duty had a similar privilege. I, therefore, submit that it is anomalous to fix any responsibility on me for the seeds stated to be destroyed and the stock book which is substituted by Messrs. K. Subba Rao and I.D. Karunakaran.

As regards the removal and destruction of the Seeds by Mr. I.D. Karunakaran, I beg to submit that he was not posted as my Assistant as brought about above but he continued in the Sale Room probably to work under the direct instructions of the Officers above me. I have had absolutely no room to question his doings as my several reports regarding the fixing up of responsibility of and the duties of Plant & Seed Clerk Mr. I.D. Karunakaran were not considered at all.

During the last week of November 1936, Mr. I.D.Karunakaran appears to have been directed by the Office Manager (I do not know whether he had instructions from the Acting Superintendent also) to attend to the arrangement of Registers, Books, Files, Implements etc. in connection with the Inspection of the Sale Depot by the Chief Secretary to the Government. I noticed that Mr.I.D.Karunakar was attending to the cleaning and rearrangement of the Almirah wherein the Seeds in question were kept and it is likely that the

Seeds in question should have been removed then. As I had no hold on Mr. I.D. Karunakaran, who was working in the Sale Room under direct instructions from the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent & Office Manager, in all matters, I could not exercise any sort of control over him and his actions.

c. As regards a report in this matter, I beg to state that a report was duly put up by me and presented to the Acting Superintendent at his residence, immediately I came to know of this fact, during the first week of December 1936, and the said report was not received by the Officer or orders passed thereon; but he assured me that he would personally enquire into the affair. On 14-12-36, however, I obtained the explanations of Messrs. I. D. Karunakaran, D.K. Gundu Rao, Venkata Reddy and Devanesan and submitted them to the Acting Superintendent for orders, as directed by him.

In summing up what I have clearly and correctly submitted above, I beg to state :-

1. That the balance of stock of Seeds was not handed over to me for safe custody by any Official or Officer so that I could safeguard them, as the question of accounting for shortages and the disposal of the balance of stock was not at all settled till the new stock book substituted by Mr. K. Subba Rao and Mr. I.D. Karunakaran brought to light, in the end of November 1936, that the Seeds in question were destroyed (vide the entries made in the germination chart and substituted stock book.)

2. That the old stock book is evidently removed by the Officials who had the privilge under the orders of the superior Officers to handle the records in the Sale Room and they have managed to substitute a new stock book in order to make up the shortages in the stock of Seeds for which they are responsible.

3. The Seeds appear to have been removed and later destroyed by Mr. I.D. Karunakaran while he was attending to the rearrangement and cleaning of the Almirah where the Seeds were kept. He was not under my control and he appears to have been working under the instructions of the Official Superiors.

4. The matter relating to the removal and destruction of Seeds was duly reported by me immediately I came to know of the same, for taking necessary disciplined action against the Official concerned.

In these circumstances, I submit once again that my explanations may kindly be accepted and I may be ordered to rejoin duty as I have been discharging my duties to the best of my ability and to the entire satisfaction of the Superior Officers.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J. P. Annamalai.

43

No.2, IV Street,
Sivanchetty Gardens, Bangalore Cantonment
Dated 11th January, 1937.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Through

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lal-Bagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter dated 25th December 1936, I beg respectfully to enclose memos Nos.1362 and 1363 both dated 7-1-37, received from the Acting Superintendent, Government Gardens, Lal-Bagh, Bangalore, directing me to furnish answers on the points enumerated therein.

I enclose herein a copy of my explanation in the above matter which shows that I am not at fault for the said allegations and irregularities and I respectfully request your goodself to kindly peruse the same and issue instructions to the Acting Superintendent to cancel the order of suspension in the light of the above facts and take me back to duty. I enclose also the copy of the certificate dated 23rd February 1935 given to me by my former Officer Mr. H.C. Javardya, regarding my work in the Department for kind perusal.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

J. P. Annachalam
11. 1. 1937.

Forwarded as enclosure to Govt. letter T.G. Cell
No. 1509 T-21. 1. 1937.

12. 21.1.37
SUPERINTENDENT.
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSORE.
21/1

Government Gardens Department.

M e m o. No.1362 D/7-1-37

With reference to the above Mr. T.P. Arunachallum is informed that the explanations furnished by him are based on mere assumptions. They are not definite and they cannot therefore be accepted. He is required to furnish his answers only for the following points :-

1. While checking the stock of seeds he had the stock book and the seeds with him. What became of them?

2. When he went on privilege leave for two months during August 1936, to whom did he hand over the charge?

3. What was the circumstances under which he cancelled his privilege leave granted to him for two months under medical advice and returned to duty within 17 days. Was there a call from the Office?

4. On returning to his duties from his leave, from whom did he take over charge?

5. The Stock Book was stated to have been in the Sale Room prior to his proceeding on leave on 7-8-1936. If so to whom did he hand over the book and why did he not take back the book as soon as he returned from the leave on 24-8-1936?

6. On the last week of November 1936 he has stated that Mr. I.D. Karunakaran removed the seeds and destroyed them. If that is so, why did he not submit his report to the undersigned on the very same day instead of on the 14th December 1936 when called for?

Sd. K. Nanjappa

Ag. Superintendent

45

GOVERNMENT GARDENS DEPARTMENT.

M E M O.
- - - - No.1363 D/7-1-37.

The following irregularities have been observed in regard to the supply of Mango plants made to Mr. A. Clerke, Sivasamudram in July 1936. Mr. T.P. Arunachalam will explain why such diviations were followed in filling up the said indent

1. Why no indent from the Sale Room was sent to the contractor for the supply of plants required for Mr. A. Clerke.
2. Where was the urgency to pay the tendered Contractor on a General Holiday - Sunday the 19th July 1936 - and obtain a Cash Bill from his while several of his bill relating to the supply made by him prior to this date were then pending payment.
3. The Tender for the supply of plants for 1936-37 had been called for and had been received by the 28th July 1936. Why were the current tender rates not considered while settling the claim of the said Contractor --for the supply made during the current year - and thus incur a loss to Government to the extent of Rs.53-8-0 in consequence.
4. Why he had not taken any action in getting the dead plants replaced as promised to Mr. A. Clerke.
5. Why the usual stamped agreement was not obtained from the accepted tenderer.

5th Janv.,'37.

Sd.K. Nanjappa

Ag. Superintendent
Government Gardens.

To

T. P. Arunachalam,
No.2, IV Street, Sivan Chetty Gardens,
Civil & Military Station, Bangalore.

11.1.37.

Mr. H. C. JAVARAYA L.Ag.,
F.L.S., F.R.H.S.
Superinterdent,

Office of the Superintendent,
Govt., Gardens in Mysore, Lal-Bagh,
Bangalore, S. India,
Dated 23 February, 1935.

# C E R T I F I C A T E.

T. P. Arunachallum, Assistant Accountant, has been working in the Government Gardens Department since March 1930 in several capacities and has given entire satisfaction to his superior officers. He is pains-taking, honest, obedient and keen at accounts. His Character and conduct are exceptionally good and deserves every encouragement.

Sd/- H. C. JAVARAYA,

Superintendent,

Government Gardens in M Y S O R E,

(TRUE COPY).

No.2, IV Street, Sivanchetty Garden,
Bangalore Cantonment,
Dated 11th Januray, 1937.

To

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lal-Bagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No.1362 dated 7-1-37 kindly delivered to me on 8-1-37, I beg to submit that my explanations dated 25-12-36 (not 28-12-36 as referred to in the memo) are all based on facts and documentary evidences and these are also self-explanatory. I am at a loss to understand which of them are based on assumptions and which of them are not definite. The detailed particulars that I have already furnished in my letters dated 22-12-36 and 25-12-36, I humbly submit, are quite enough to show that I am not at fault for the said allegations. I therefore respectfully request that those particulars may kindly be verified by a detailed enquiry of persons responsible and with reference to documents enumerated therein.

In regard to the several points on which I am required to furnish my answers I beg to submit the same in their relative order:

The Stock Book in question has been substituted by a new one as already enumerated by me in my previous letters by Messrs.I.D. Karunakaran and K. Subba Rao, who are also responsible for its creation. They had a free hand with all the documents in the Sale Depot.

The Seeds in question should have been removed by Mr.I.D. Karunakaran while cleaning the Almirah where the Seeds were kept, during the last week of November 1936, vide report of Messrs.D.K. Gundu Rao, Venkata Reddy and Devanesan in the matter. The detailed circumstances that led to such irregularities have been fully brought out in my letters dated 22nd and 25th December 1936 and no desciplinary action has been taken as yet against the officials concerned.

I went on casual leave in August 1936 on account of ill-health in the first instance. As I was seriously ill and did not recover, I was forced to apply for privilege leave. Under these circumstances it was not possible for me to hand over the charge of the Sale Depot and then avail the leave. Further, there was no communication from the office during my illness to the effect that I should come and hand over charge, vide memo communicating the sanction of leave to me.

Two months' privilege leave was applied for, for rest and treatment, but I recovered from illness within the course of a fortnight and therefore I reported myself for duty, by way of not forfeiting unnecessarily the leave at my credit and to avail the unavailed portion at a later period as and when the occasion arises. Regarding my reporting to duty after 17 days, there was no call from the Office.

After my return to duty I received charge of cash only from Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao, Plant & Seed Clerk, vide the entries in the Cash Book to this effect and orders of the Superintendent on my Duty Report. Mr. I. D. Karunakaran, who was posted during my absence to the Sales Depot, as already submitted continued to work in the Sale Room. No detailed charge of Sale Room was handed over to me.

The Stock Book in question could not be handed over to anybody as I was forced to proceed on leave as stated in para 1 above. On return to duty I found that Mr.K. Subba Rao and Mr. I.D. Karunakaran were handling the records for accounting towards the shortage of Seeds, as already explained by me. The above officials have managed to substitute the new Stock Book of Seeds and a germination chart during my absence and the said manipulations were brought to light when the final explanation of Mr.K.Subba Rao and Mr. I.D. Karunakaran were called for during the last week of November 1936. Further, the maintenance of Stock Book and the handling of Seeds are the duties of the Plant & Seed Clerk and the question of accounting for the shortages was still pending and taking charge of either the Stock Book or Seeds did not at all arise. As already pointed out in my letter dated 25-12-36 several

several officials namely Messrs.P.B. Subramanyam, V. Ramachandra Rao I.D. Karunakaran, K. Subba Rao and the Office Manager Mr.V. Raghavendra Rao have handled the records of the Sale Room (vide my report in this respect on my return to duty) and whether such documents that were removed from the Sale Depot during my absence were returne is not clear as no inventory was made for such records. The memo calling for an explanation from the Office Manager in the above matter has not been finally dealt with.

The Statement that Mr.I.D. Karunakaran should have removed and destroyed the Seeds in the last week of November 1936 is only based on the detailed enquiry made by me during 1st Week in Decembe 1936 of the Sale Room Staff and I did not know of the removal of the Seeds till then. Immediately I came to know of this fact I reported the matter to the Acting Superintendent and the memo submitted by me was neither accepted nor orders passed thereon vide paras 3 page 4 of letter dated 25-12-36. The Acting Superintendent on this information was making direct enquiries in the matter with the Sale Room [redacted] Staff and therefore there was no reason to say that I did not report this matter and further, action was being taken by the Officer by way of sealing the packer's room and searching the contents thereof by persons : Messrs. P.B. Subramanyam, V. Ramachandra Rao and the Office Daffedar. The searching of the packer's room was made directly by the above Officials (and the undersigned had no part in it) and no inventories seems to have been made towards the result of the search. Therefore, it is evident that steps were taken regarding the disposal of the Seeds in question by the Acting Superintendent. Subsequently the memo No.176 dated 14-12-36 was issued to me and the explanations of the official working in the Sale Room (Messrs.D.K.Gundu Rao, Venkata Reddy and Devanesan) were duly obtained and submitted by me in the matter of the balance of Seeds and their statements then brought to light that Mr. I.D. Karunakaran removed the Seeds in question and later destroyed them.

Under these circumstances I humbly beg to submit that I have discharged my duties to the best of my abilities and reported to my superior Officers all short-comings in time. I request that I may kindly be taken back to duty and any of my explanations, if required, will be furnished as and when necessary.

Further, as I am in great hardship on account of non-receipt of my pay till to-day, I request you to kindly order the period of suspension as privilege leave to which I am entitled and order fo the disbursement of my pay for December 1936.

For which act of kindness I shall be grateful.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

T. P. Annachalam.

11. 1. 37.

No.2, IV Street, Sivanchetty Garden,
Bangalore Cantonment,
Dated 11th January, 1937.

To
The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lal-Bagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to memo No.1363 dated 7-1-37 requiring me to explain why certain diviations were made in filling up the Indent for mango plants to Mr. A. Clarke, I beg to submit as follows : -

1) It is usual that the plants are procured on selection ~~and paid for~~ On approval of the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent of the plants, they will be paid for. No indent was sent in this case as in other similar cases where selection of plants was made by the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent himself. The Superintendent has selected the plants in this case.

2) The cost of the plants in question was received in advance from the party who desired that the supply of plants should be made to his Agent on or about the date of their purchase. Hence the plants were purchased and paid for in full settlement. The Sale Room is open for transaction on week days and on Sundays and General Holidays on engagements, for the benefit of its constituents. All emergent orders are executed on holidays, as well and expenditure incurred therefor. In this case also as the party stated that arrangements have to be made to deliver the plants to his agent on or about the date of the purchase, this order was treated as urgent and expenditure incurred to execute the same. The other bills which may not have been paid for on that date might probably relate to monthly supplies which had to be paid for only at the end of the month or for supplies on account of plants the cost of which might not have been recovered in advance.

3) The plants required in this case had to be selected and only good, tall and healthy, true-to-type plants ready

ready for planting had to be supplied to the party. In these circumstances the ruling market rate for such selected plants charged by the firm had to be paid for (the plants of ordinary vde. usually obtained at tender rates were not suitable to the equirements of the party). Further, the payment at the ruling market rates is usual where the tender rates are not available or when the purchase is made on selection only. In this case the tender was not accepted at the time of the transaction and moreover the plants were obtained on selection. This transaction has resulted in a profit to Government and no loss as stated has been sustained (the amount charged to the party is more than what such plants actually costed, vide the party's bill and the Departmental bill to Mr. A. Clerke).

4. As regards the replacement of dead plants, I have taken action in the matter and the Contractor has, as usual, agreed to replace the dead plants when required, but the party did not make any arrangement with his Agent to take delivery of them till I handed over charge on 21-12-36.

5. In this case no agreement is necessary as the purchase was made once for all for cash. If the agreement referred to relates to the supply of plants from Messrs. Puttanna & Sons, I beg to state that he has been directed to execute the same when his quotations were accepted. Further, his contract is not a Tender supported by earnest money etc. but is only a quotation which is called for and accepted every year.

In the above circumstances it is evident that the transactions had been made according to the orders of the Superintendent and I beg to submit that there are no irregularities and diviations on my part in executing this order.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T. P. Aruna chalam.
11. 1. 37.

Appendix F G—1].

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section G. G

File No. 39-36

Serial No. 3

*Diary No. of letter replied to*.....

No. D 4874

To

The Supdt. G-G

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

*the* *193*

Sir

I am directed to convey approval of Govt to your action in having placed Mr. T. P. Arunachalam Assistant Accountant of your office on other duty as talaiman. Lal Bag Depot under Suspension vide letter dated 21-12-36

~~on account of the missing of the [illegible] of the subjected to him.~~

~~A further report in the matter is awaited.~~

I have &c

Chief Eng

Date of issue 26-1-37

Signed by Mr. K. Subba Rao

in connection with the loss of imported seeds from the Stock in the depot -.

The submission of the final report may be expedited

Memo D 4875. 20/1/37

List of enclosures.....

Copies of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Comptroller for information

Copied by .....

B. O

Examined by.....

WD 03601—GPB—30,000—23-9-35

20/1/37 Chief Eng

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. D 4874/G.G. 39-36-3 *Bangalore, Dated,* 25th January 1937.

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Superintendent,

Government Gardens, Bangalore.

Sir,

I am directed to convey approval of Government to your action in having placed Mr. T.P. Arunachalam, Assistant Accountant of your office on other duty as Salesman, Lal Bagh Depot, under Suspension, with effect from 21st December 1936 in connection with the loss of imported seeds from the stock in the Depot.

The submission of the final report may be expedited.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Chief Secretary to Government.

G.G 39-36-4

No. 1608
Enc.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSORE.

LAL-BAGH, BANGALORE.

*Dated* 29-1- *1937.*

30 JAN. 1937

DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

FROM

K.HANJAPPA, ESQ.,
~~M.K.SITARAM CHETTY, ESQ., L.A.~~,
*Offg. Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore,*
*Bangalore.*

CHIEF SECRETARY
29 JAN 193
GOVT. OF MYSORE

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter -- No. D 4874/GG 39-36-3 dated 25/26th instant approving my action taken in having placed Mr T.P.Arunachallum under suspension and to submit a final report, I have the honour to state that the final report has already been submitted to Government in this office letter No.1508 dated 21-1-1937.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant,

K. Hanjappa 29.1.37

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

28/1/37

WD 0454—GPB—1,000—24-10-35

193

From

M. K. SITARAM CHETTY, ESQ., L.Ag.,
Offg. *Superintendent,*
*Government Gardens in Mysore,*
*Bangalo*

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

G.B. 39-36-5

No. 1633

Enc. 3

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSORE.

LAL-BAGH, BANGALORE,

Dated 30.1.1937.

Tel-Address:
"HORTI, BANGALORE"

FROM

K.NANJAPPA, ESQ.,
~~H.C.JAVARAYA, ESQ., I.A.S., F.L.S., F.R.H.S.,~~
Offg Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No.1508 dated - 21-1-1937, I have the honour to submit herewith for information a copy of the explanation furnished by Mr T.P.Arunachallum in respect of the purchase of 100 Oranges and 200 limes -- at a cost of Rs 11-7-0 and my reply thereon. This is another instance to show that he has failed to carry out his duties properly.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant,

K. Nanjappa 29.1.37

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

Submit for perusal.
The main file about
the suspension of the
Officiant has been sent
to the Chief Secy on 29/1/37 (D. 3877) 29/1
1st 3.2.37
C.S.

Kind refee is invited to the notings in the linked file
Ch Secy 1st 8.2.37

57

Copy of the memo No.S.R.822 dated 21-1-1937 from the-Superintendent, Government Gardens, Bangalore, to Mr T.P. Arunachallum, Sivanchetty Gardens, C.& M. Station, Bangalor -e.

It has been observed that on 10-11-36 a sum of ---- Rs 11-7-0 has been paid by him to one Mr Channappa, for the supply of 100 oranges and 200 limes. Mr T.P.Arunachallum is requested to explain who Channappa is and when the - seeds collected were given to Propagator for sowing and his acknowledgment obtained.

Sd/- K.Nanjappa,

Offg Superintendent,
Government Gardens.

COPY.

K. Nanjappa 22.1.37

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

57

No.2 IV Street,
Sivanchetty Gardens, Bangalore
22nd January 1937. Cantt

To

The Superintendent,

Government Gardens,

Lalbagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to Memo No.S.R.822 dated 21-1-37 I beg to state that Mr Channappa from whom the fruits in question were purchased is a Fruit Vendor. Subsequently, the seeds were removed and soon-after they were free from water and moisture, they were handed over to the Plant Propagator, Lalbagh for sowing and his acknowledgment in this case was not obtained as in previous cases. The purchase wa made under orders of the Superintendent from this Vendor as there a no tendered contractors for the supply of fruits to the department during the year 1936-37.

In this connection I beg to invite your kind reference to my detailed reports regarding the above matter in reply to office memo dated 14-12-1936 on the same subject and to the Propagator's statemen regarding the quantity of Seeds received by him and their disposal.

In conclusion I beg to submit that I may kindly be taken back to duty and my explanations, if any required, will be duly submitted as and when they are required.

Further, I request that my pay for the month of December 1936 (as it is already 22-1-37) may kindly be ordered to be disbursed to me treating the period of suspension as privilege leave to which I a entitled, since I have been put to great hardship for want of the pa

I beg to remain Sir

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- T.P.Arunachallum

COPY.

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

Government Gardens Department.

M e m o

Reference:- His explanation dated 22-1-1937 in respect of the purchase of fruits at a cost of Rs 11-7-0.

-:0:-

The explanation furnished in the above is not satisfactory in the following circumstances.-

1. Failure to obtain permission in writing to purchase fruits.

2. Failure to call for quotations for the supply of fruits instead of placing direct orders.

3. Failure to obtain acknowledgment of the Propagator for the seeds given to him.

4. The full quantities of seeds expected from 100 orange fruits and 200 limes were not given for sowing as the seedlings in the pan were only about 40 to 60.

5. Failure to show the fruits or seeds produced to the undersigned who was in Headquarters then.

The undersigned is ~~therefore~~ doubtful whether the fruits were purchased at all and ~~hence~~ the bill must be a false one. Mr T.P.Arunachal should make good the amount of Rs 11-7-0 immediately.

His pay for 21 days in the month of December 1936 has been paid to him on 28-1-1937 and his acknowledgment is filed in the office.

Sd/- K. NANJAPPA,

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

To

Mr T.P.Arunachallum
No.2 IV Street,
Sivanchetty Gardens,
B A N G A L O R E CANTT.

COPY.

K. Nanjappa 29.1.37

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

60

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
GOVT. GARDENS IN MYSORE,

LAL-BAGH, BANGALORE.

*Dated* 15.2. 1937

4419 SEC. & HOME DEPARTMENT 16 FEB. 1937 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

FROM K.Nanjappa, Esq.,
~~xMxKxSITARAM CHETTYxEsqxxx~~
*Offg. Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore, Bangalore.*

CHIEF SECRETARY 15.FEB.1937 GOVT. OF MYSORE

G. G 39-36-6

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No.1633 dated 30-1-1937 I have the honor to submit herewith two letters dated 1st and 9th - February 1937 addressed to you by Mr T.P.Arunachallum enclosing - copies of his explanations furnished to me with reference to this - office memo No.1634 dated 30-1-1937 regarding purchase of fruits at a cost of Rs 11-7-0 for seed purposes. It may be seen therefrom that - the answers given by him are evasive and do not contain satisfactory explanations. Under these circumstances I consider that the purchase of fruits by Mr T.P.Arunachallum is false and I request that the - amount may kindly be ordered to be recovered from his pay.

2. An expenditure of Rs 3/- was incurred by Mr T.P.Arunachallum for the presentation of a Bouquet in connection with a Distinguished Guest. His explanation furnished is herewith submitted.The flowers - were available in the garden and the expenditure could have been avoid -ed. The bill for Rs 3/- claimed by him is also false. The sum of Rs 3/- already recovered from his pay may kindly be approved.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant,
K. Nanjappa 11.2.37
Offg Superintendent

11.2.37

WD 0454—GPB—1,000—24-10-35



From

M. K. SITARAM CHETTY, ESQ., L.AG.
Offg. *Superintendent,*
*Government Gardens in Mysore,*
*Bangalore.*

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

No.2, IV Street,
Sivanchetty Garden, Bangalore Cantt.
1st February, 1937

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Through

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens
Lalbagh, BANGALORE.

Sir,

I beg to erclose herewith copies of memo No.S.R.822 dated 21-1-37 and memo No.1634 dated 30-1-37 received from the Superintendent, Government Gardens, Lalbagh, Bangalore, xx in the matter of purchase of fruits on 10th November 1936 with my explanations thereto for kind perusal.

I beg to state that in the light of the several documents in support of my statements, I am not at fault for the said allegations and the procedure adopted as usual is in order.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T. P. Annachalam

D.H.833/31-1-37.

Memo.

It has been observed that on 10th November 1936, a sum of 11-7-0 has been paid by him to one Mr. Channappa for the supply of 100 oranges and 200 limes. Mr. T.P. Arunachallum is requested to explain who Channappa is and when the seeds collected were given to Propagator for sowing and his acknowledgment obtained.

Sd. K. Nanjappa

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

20-1-37

To

Mr. T.P.Arunachallum,
Sivanchettyg gardens,
C.& M.Station, Bangalore.

(Copy)

No.2, IV Street,
Sivanchetty Garden, Bangalore Cantt.
22nd January 1937.

To

The Superintendent,

Government Gardens,

Lal-Bagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to Memo No. S.R.822 dated 21-1-37 I beg to state that Mr. Channappa from whom the fruits in question were purchased is a Fruit Vendor. Subsequently, the seeds were removed and soon after they were free from water and moisture, they were handed over to the Plant Propagator, Lalbagh for sowing and his acknowledgment in this case was not obtained as in previous cases. The purchase was made under orders of the Superintendent from this Vendor as there are no tendered contractors for the supply of fruits to the department during the year 1936-37.

In this connection I beg to invite your kind reference to my detailed reports regarding the above matter in reply to Office Memo dated 14-12-'36 on the same subject and to the Propagator's statement regarding the quantity of Seeds received by him and their disposal.

In conclusion I beg to submit that I may kindly be taken back to duty and my explanations, if any required, will be duly submitted as and when they are required.

Further, I request that my pay for the month of December 1936 (as it is already 22-1-37) may kindly be ordered to be disbursed to me treating the period of suspension as privilege leave to which I am entitled, since I have been put to great hardship for want of the pay.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Sd. T.P.A.

(copy)

Government Gardens Department.

M e m o. No.1634 D/30-1-37.

Reference:- His explanation dated 22-1-1937 in respect of t purchase of fruits at a cost of Rs.11-7-0.

The explanation furnished in the above is not satisfactory in the following circumstances:-

1. Failure to obtain permission in writing to purchase fruits.
2. Failure to call for quotations for the supply of fruits instead of placing direct orders.
3. Failure to obtain acknowledgment of the propagator for the seeds given to him.
4. The full quantities of seeds expected from 100 orange fruits and 300 limes were not given for showing as th seedlings in the pan were only about 40 to 60.
5. Failure to show the fruits or seeds produced to the undersigned who was in quarters then.

The undersigned is doubtful whether the fruits were purchased at all and therefore the bill must be a false one. Mr. T.P. Arunachallum should make good the amount of Rs.11-7-0 immediately.

His pay for 21 days in the month of December 1936 has been paid to him on 28-1-1937 and his acknowledgment is filed in the office.

Sd. K. Nanjappa

29-1-37.

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

To

Mr. T.P. Arunachallum,
No.2 IV Street,
Sivanchetty Gardens,
B A N G A L O R E CANTT.

(True Copy)

No.2, IV Street,
Sivanchetty Garden, Bangalore Cantt.
1st February, 1937.

To

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lalbagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to your memo No.1634 dated 30-1-37 stating that my explanation in respect of the purchase of Fruits at a cost of Rs.11-7-0 is unsatisfactory, I beg to submit the following in continuation thereof.

1. Permission to purchase the Fruits could not be got recorded in writing as the oral orders of the Superintendent was obtained (vide pay order of the Superintendent approving the purchase). Orders relating to these purchases are obtained both in writing in some cases and orally in ~~some~~ other cases from the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent. In this case the Superintendent's oral order has been obtained as already explained in my explanation dated 22-1-1937.

2. In the absence of approved tendered contractors the requirements are procured at ruling market rates. Accordingly, the purchases were made under the immediate orders and supervision of the Superintendent and since the value of Fruits purchased was below Rs.12/-, quotations could not be called for as in previous cases, (purchases duly approved by the Superintendent as evidenced by the pay order on the bill.

3. As already explained by me in my explanation dated 22-1-37 acknowledgment for the seeds issued to Propagator is not being obtained in similar cases and in the absence of any specific order, contrary to the above procedure, the usual practice was followed in this case. However, the Propagator has duly acknowledged that he had received the seeds in question as evident from his reply to the memo issued in the matter.

4. The entire seeds collected out of 100 oranges and 200 Lime fruits were handed over to the Plant Propagator and these were not counted or weighed as heretofore, Regarding the

result of germination, the Propagator may kindly be ascertained The Propagator has certified that the seeds were sown in six pans and usually each pan accommodates hundreds of seeds. It is clear, therefore, that the seeds handed over to him were reall more than what is referred to in the memo and I am at a loss to understand how only 40 to 60 seedlings are stated to have been in existance. Whether the seeds that were not germinated were not taken into consideration or whether the seeds that were actually sown have been removed later by others is a question which has to be investigated.

5. The Fruits and the seeds were duly shown to the Superintendent and therefore it was superfluous to show them again to the Assistant Superintendent as it is usual that one of the Officers of the Department sees them. There are no specific orders to the effect that the seeds and the Fruits should be shown to both the Officers while effecting the purchase.

Under the above circumstances, the transaction in question can least be doubted and the several documentary evidences viz., bill of the supplier with the pay order of the Superintendent, entry in the stock book duly attested by the Superintendent, the Propagator's certificate that he has received the seeds and the subsequent sowing all go to show that the said transaction is perfectly a genuine one and as such no question of recovery of the amount from me does arise.

In conclusion, I beg to request you to kindly accept the above explanations in view of the facts enumerated therein

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

H P Annachalam

No.2, IV Street,
Sivanchetty Garden, Bangalore Cantt.
9th February, 1937.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Through

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lalbagh, BANGALORE.

Sir,

I beg to enclose herewith copies of memo No.1710 dated 5-2-37 and received from the Superintendent, Government Gardens, Lalbagh, Bangalore, and my explanations thereto for kind perusal.

I beg to state that in the light of the several points explained in detail in my letter dated 1st instant and subsequent particulars submitted herewith, I am not at fault for said allegations and the procedure adopted, as usual, is in order.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T. P. Annachalam.

Government Gardens Department.

M E M O. No. 1710 D. 5-2-37.

His explanation dated 1-2-1937 furnished with reference to this office No 1634 regarding the purchase of fruits at a cost of Rs 11-7-0.

With reference to the above, Mr T.P.Arunachallum is further directed to explain the following. The reply must be brief and should contain only the answer to the point.

1.How did the question of purchasing the fruits arise? Was there any requisition for the seeds from the Propogator? Who purchased the fruits and who received them?

2.Is he aware that all fruits bought for the purpose of seeds are generally sent for fruit preservation and the seeds obtained used to be given over to the Propogator? Why were the fruits purchased not sent in this instance and who consumed the fruits? The Government have entailed severe loss in this transaction.

3.The fruits were purchased on 10-11-36 and the seeds ought to have been sown after a week hence. The exact date of his handing over the seeds is not furnished by him and the propagator who is said to have received the seeds has also not given the date and he says that only two pans of Lime and 5 pans of orange seeds were sown. According to the data, there ought to be at least, more than twenty pans of lime and twenty of oranges. In the Diary maintained by the Assistant Propogator (which is understood is the only record usually made by the propogator) it is seen that 3 pans of limes and 3 pans of orange seeds were sown on 1-12-1936 which is after a difference of 20 days. The undersigned thinks therefore that the seeds sown by the assistant Propogator on 1-12-1936 has no bearing with the transaction made on 10-11-1936. Under the above circumstances, the undersigned is of opinion, that the bill claimed by him is false and MrT.P.Arunachallum is therefore liable to make good the amount of Rs 11-7-0 paid by him from Saleroom funds.

( Sd) K.Nanjappa.

Offg Superintendant,
G

To

T.P.Arunachallum.
Bangalore Cantt.

(Copy)

No.2, IV Street,
Sivanchetty Garden, Bangalore Cantt.
9th February, 1937.

To

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lalbagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to your memo No.1710 dated 5-2-37 kindly delivered to me on 8-2-37, I beg to submit my reply thereto on the several points:-

1. Fruits are purchased for seed purposes whenever they are required for propagation by the propagator. Orders relating to these purchases are obtained from the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent orally and sometimes written also. In this case only on oral representation for the necessity of seeds by the propagator to the Superintendent the latter has in turn placed his orders for the purchase through the Sale Depot, as usual and hence the necessity for the purchase. The fruits were purchased by the Superintendent and these were received by the Sale Depot (vide the Certificates of stock on the Bill and Stock Book duly attested by the Superintendent).

2. The undersigned is not aware of any order written or oral to the effect that all fruits bought for the purpose of seeds should be sent for the fruit preservation and the seeds obtained given over to the propagator." It is usual that fruits required for fruit preservation are exclusively quite different from those that are required for seed purposes. To obtain good seeds, only overripe fruits were purchased and these were practically quite unfit for either fruit preservation or consumption. It is not understood how Government have entailed a very severe loss in this transaction which amounts to Rs.11-7-0, as the fruits purchased were only for seed purposes and the seeds duly collected have been handed over to the plant propagator.

3. As already explained by me in my previous letters the entire seeds that were collected were as usual given to the

the propagator and these were not counted or weighed. I am not aware whether there was any delay in sowing them. Regarding the data pertaining to the collection of seeds, there was no similar procedure or specific order hitherto. The Salesman confines himself to the collection of the seeds and hands them over for sowing and the details regarding the germination etc. the propagator maintains them.

Under the above circumstances and in view of the following facts (1) Party's bill for the supply, (2) Pay order of the Superintendent on the Bill in support of the said transactions, (3) The relative entries on the bill and the Stock Book duly attested by the Superintendent, (4) The propagator's report that he has received the seeds in question and the subsequent sowing, I beg to submit that the transaction is a genuine one and expenditure incurred is bona fide and also in the interest of public service. The Bill in question has been preferred by the Supplier and not by me, and the same was ordered to be paid by the Superintendent. Hence the payment is in order and the question of my making good the amount of Rs.11-7-0 does not arise.

In conclusion I beg to request you to kindly accept the above explanations and what I have already explained in my previous letters.

I beg to remain,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,
T.P. Annamalai

No.2, IV street,
Sivanchetty Gardens,
Bangalore Cantt., 2-2-37.

To
The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lalbagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No.1634 dated 30-1-37 (vide last para) stating that my pay for 21 days in the month of December 1936 has been disbursed to me on 28-1-37, and my acknowledgment therefor, I beg to subm that I have received only a sum of Rs 24/- and receipt No.26/17 dated --- 28-1-37 for Rs 3/- issued by the office.

I am at a loss to understand why a sum of Rs 3/- was recovered from me though it is stated that this recovery is on account of cost of rose flowers as per V.No.104. I remember that the cost of rose flowers purchas -d is only Re.1/- and not Rs 3/- as stated above. If, however, this amount represents the cost of materials purchased for preparing boquets (for -- presentation to a distinguished visitor of Lalbagh) I beg to submit the following :-

1. The expenditure is bona fide and it is usual to present boquets to the distinguished visitors under orders of either the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent .

2. No vouchers could be procured in this case as the materials viz, rose flowers, boquet ribbons, frames and thread(green and white) were -- purchased from different persons in the market on payment of cash, the - first three late in the previous evening and the boquets' ribbons early in the morning (on the day of the visit). The boquets were ordered to be ready at 8 a.m. Since the instructions regarding the preparation of - boquets were received very late on the previous evening and as these were required to be presented the next morning at 8 a.m. there was no time to follow the usual procedure.

3. The procedure laid out in M.C.A.C.Volume I has been duly follow in this case viz the statement of account was furnished (in the absence o detailed vouchers) and this has been duly approved by the Office Manager as usual when either the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent is not available in the office at the time of the transaction.

4. In view of the above facts and that the boquets were actually prepared by the Propagator (vide his initials in the statement of -- account rendered) and the Manager's record in the Office Diary(regardi the visit of the distinguished visitor) and his initial in the statemer of account approving the transaction in question, I humbly submit that the expenditure incurred is bona fide and I therefore request that the amount recovered may kindly be ordered to be refunded to me.

I beg to remain Sir

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- T.P.Arunachallum

COPY.

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

-13-

M e m o No.1746 dated 10-2-37.

References :- His letter dated [illegible]-1937.

With reference to the above, he is informed that his pay for 21 day in December 1936 amounting to Rs 27-2-0 has been drawn. Out of which, a sum of Rs 7-7-0 which has to be deducted towards Mysore state Life Insurance - has not been deducted by the audit office in the bill and the gross amoun of Rs 27-2-0 was passed in T No.531 dated 27-1-1937. Hence the gross amoun of Rs 27-2-0 has been disbursed to him, deducting a sum of Rs 3/- which was spent by him without proper authority for purchasing roses and boquets; ribbons etc and the cost thereof could have been evidently avoided as ros flowers were available then in the garden. In these circumstances, your explanation cannot be accepted.

Further, precise answers on the following points may be furnished:-

1. It is seen that he paid a sum of Rs 3/- on 19-10-36 for rose flowers e Where did he pay it from?
2. How many rose flowers did he purchase? Where was the necessity to - purchase when flowers were available in the garden?
3. Where is voucher for the 4 yards ribbon purchased?
4. How many Boquet frames and thread were purchased? Did he use all th materials?
5. The authority in writing if any for incurring the expenditure said to have been obtained by the Manager may be produced.

Sd/- K.Nanjappa,

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

To
Mr T.P.Arunachallum,
No.2, IVth street,
Sivanchetty Gardens,
Bangalore Cantt.

COPY. K. Nanjappa

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

No.2 IV street,
Sivanchetty Gardens.
Bangalore Cantt.,11-2-193

To

The Superintendent,
Government Gardens,
Lalbagh, Bangalore.

Sir,

In obedience to your memo No.1746 dated 16-2-37 kindly delivered to me on 10-2-37 I beg to state that the sum of Rs 3/- was incurred -- under proper authority viz, with the explicit orders of the then --- Superintendent who actually presented the Boquets to the distinguished visitors while the statement of account was duly approved by the - Office Manager.

As regards the other points I beg to reply as follows :-

1. The payment of Rs 3/- was made from the Sale room funds in the first instance treating it as advance payment, pending the later recoupment from the office funds. This is the procedure that is always followed when payments cannot be made directly from the office cash when the - Office Cashier is not available or when the Office Imprest has run shor Immediately the Cash was received from the Office Cashier on surrender- ing the voucher the amount advanced was adjusted. In all such cases - when expenditures are incurred under other Heads of Accounts other than the Sale Room (as explained above) no corresponding entries are made i the Sale Room Cash Book.

2. One Hundred Rose flowers were purchased for the preparation of Boquets. The fact that the propagator himself has attested his initial to the statement of account rendered clearly shows that the flowers required for the purpose were either not available in the garden or those available were not suited for the purpose, and hence the necessi for the purchase.

3. As already explained by me in my letter dated 2nd instant the - purchase of ribbons having been made early in the morning on the day of the presentation in the Market for cash, no voucher could be obtain ed.

4. Boquet Frames and thread were purchased in the market and they were handed over to the Propagator as usual. I do not remember at thi distance of time as to the exact number of articles. As it is usual

to purchase only articles to the extent they are actually required for the purpose, the articles in this case might have been entirely used for the occasion. This fact may, if necessary, be ascertained fr the Propagator.

5. The authority for incurring the expenditure has already been - submitted in my previous explanation viz, the Oral Orders of the - Superintendent. The Manager's approval of the transaction on the statement of account rendered corroborates it. The vouchsr filed in the office bears initials of the Manager and I submit therefore that the Manager should have also had similar instructions from the ---- Superintendent, (in the absence of which he would not have approved the transaction).

6. Under the above circumstances the expenditure having been -- actually incurred is bonafide in the interest of public service, I beg to submit that the recovery of the amount from me is highly anomolous as the expenditure could not evidently be avoided.

In conclusion, I request you to kindly order to refund the - amount already recovered.

I beg to remain Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- T.P.Arunachallum

COPY.

Offg Superintendent
Government Gardens

G. G. 39-36-7

7-

...CO...DI... S CI... ...CV... ...T CF

...S ...I... ...S ...d... ...d... CI... ...YSORE.

-----:C:-----

...d :-

L... r ...o. ...d... ...d ...d... D... ...r
...d ...rom ... Su... ...ndent, ...ov...nt ...rde...
in ...sor... ...rti... ...t ...P. ...rmac...and, ...s
...cco... ...f ... ...is ...ici... as ...aced ...nder s...
si... ...rom ... ...list Ide... as ...e had ...ailed in his
d...ties ... not ...e...in... in Safe ...stod... the ...a...n
...r ... c... ...f i...ort...d Seeds entrusted to him in
...y ...r...

...e. C...rre... ...ade ...di... ...t ...tter ...o. E
...d... ...d ... ...d ...t ...r... ...r... ...ro... ...e
...u...ri...e...e..., ...ver... ...ardens in ...ysore,
...s...itti... ... ...is ...r... ...ts ...e ex...anations
...r... ...r... ...e ...e...ra... ...re...ul ...ri...i...s
...e...d... ...e ...e ...e ...itted ... ...e ...ici...l.

Order No. D 5836-37/GG.39-36-7
Dated, Bangalore, 27-2-37.

The Superintendent, ...ver... ...ardens, ...s
re...orted ...at ...P. ...rmac...ar ...as f...led in
is d...ties i... not c...ry...in... out ...is instructions
to ...e... in ...a... c...sto..., ...e ...a...ce of ...ock o...
i...ort...d seeds ...ntrusted to ...i... and ...at ...e
...e...d ... ...r ...e ...ici...l i... ...r...ct ... ...e
...r...e...ll, ...ct...d ...r...ac...ce ...is ...a...e ...nto sus-
...ici...n.

...r... ...e...ort ... ...e ...ac...s ... In...ec...i...
... ...e ...ffice ... ...e Su...eri...tendent, ...ove...n...
...ar... ...e... ...y ...e ...ndian ...ri...ers to ...ov...n...,
i... ...s ...r...ct ...at ...e ...as ...o... ...ll ...i...s
...a... ...o... ...e ...n... ...e ...a... ...e ...ver... ...r

The Superintendent, Government Printing,

The Controller to Government.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Read:-

Letter No.1270 dated the 22nd December 1936, from the Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore, reporting that T.P. Arunachalam, Assistant Accountant of his office was placed under suspension from the 21st idem as he had failed in his duties by not keeping in safe custody the balance of stock of imported seeds entrusted to him in May last.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No.1768 dated the 15th February 1937, from the Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore, submitting, with his remarks, the explanations of Arunachalam on the several irregularities alleged to have been committed by the Official.

---

ORDER NO. ಪ 5836-37 ಆ ಅ 37-38-1 ಶ 27.2.37

Dated, Bangalore, the 27th February 1937.

The Superintendent, Government Gardens has reported that T.P. Arunachalam has failed in his duties in not carrying out his instructions to keep in safe custody the balance of stock of imported seeds entrusted to him and that the conduct of the official in respect of the marginally noted transactions is open to suspicion.

Alleged purchase of oranges and limes of the value of Rs.11-7-0 from one Mr. Channappa.

Payment of Rs.3/- made for the purchase of flowers for preparing a bouquet for presentation, and

supply of mango plants to Mr. Clarke.

From a perusal of the notes of Inspection of the Office of the Superintendent, Government Gardens, by the Chief Secretary to Government, it is observed that all is not well with the Sale Room at Lalbagh and that several other officials appear to be involved in the shortage of seeds noticed. Government are inclined to think that before fixing the responsibility of Arunachalam for the shortages etc., a fuller enquiry is necessary into the conduct of the following officials :-

(1) K.Subba Rao.
(2) V.Ramachandra Rao.
(3) T.P.Arunachalam.
(4) I.D.Karunakaran.
(5) P.B.Subramanyam, a n d
(6) D.K.Gundu Rao.

One particular act of misconduct deserves to be severely noticed and that relates to the destruction of seeds by the Sale Room Staff after the Chief Secretary commenced the enquiry into the conduct of Mr.Sitharam Chetty. How this was brought about and which of the officials actually took part in it requires to be thoroughly investigated. The present Superintendent, Narayana Reddy, is requested to hold a regular enquiry into the conduct of the above officials in regard to this and other cognate matters, and submit a report of his findings early for the orders of Government.

Pending receipt of the above report and orders of Government thereon, T.P.Arunachalam may be allowed to rejoin his post of Assistant Accountant the question as to how the period of suspension is to be treated being determined on the result of the enquiry now ordered.

Chief Secretary to Government.

The Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore.
Comptroller to Government.

K.M.R.4.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Read:-

Letter No.1270 dated the 22nd December 1936, from the Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore, reporting that T.P. Arunachalam, Assistant Accountant of his office was placed under suspension from the 21st idem as he had failed in his duties by not keeping in safe custody the balance of stock of imported seeds entrusted to him in May last.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No.1760 dated the 15th February 1937, from the Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore, submitting, with his remarks, the explanations of Arunachalam on the several irregularities alleged to have been committed by the Official.

---

ORDER NO. D 5836-37/ G G-37-36-7.

Dated, Bangalore, the 27th February 1937.

The Superintendent, Government Gardens has reported that T.P. Arunachalam has failed in his duties in not carrying out his instructions to keep in safe custody the balance of stock of imported seeds entrusted to him and that the conduct of the official in respect of the marginally noted transactions is open to suspicion.

1) Alleged purchase of oranges and limes of the value of Rs.11-7-0 from one Mr. Channappa.

2) Payment of Rs.3/- made for the purchase of flowers for preparing a bouquet for presentation, and

(3) supply of mango plants to Mr. Clarke.

From a perusal of the notes of Inspection of the office of the Superintendent, Government Gardens, by the Chief Secretary to Government, it is observed that all is not well with the Sale Room at Lalbagh and that several other officials appear to be involved in the shortage of seeds noticed. Government are inclined to think that before fixing the responsibility of Arunachalam for the shortages etc., a fuller enquiry is necessary into the conduct of the following officials :-

(1) K. Subba Rao.
(2) V. Ramachandra Rao.
(3) T.P. Arunachalam.
(4) I.D. Karunakaran.
(5) P.B. Subramanyam, a n d
(6) D.K. Gundu Rao.

One particular act of misconduct deserves to be severely noticed and that relates to the destruction of seeds by the Sale Room Staff after the Chief Secretary commenced the enquiry into the conduct of Mr. Sitharam Chetty. How this was brought about and which of the officials actually took part in it requires to be thoroughly investigated.. The present Superintendent, Mr. Narayana Reddy, is requested to hold a regular enquiry into the conduct of the above officials in regard to this and other cognate matters. and submit a report of his findings early for the orders of Government.

Pending receipt of the above report and orders of Government thereon, T.P. Arunachalam may be allowed to rejoin his post of Assistant Accountant, the question as to how the period of suspension is to be treated being determined on the result of the enquiry now ordered.

Krishnaswamy

for Chief Secretary to Governme

The Superintendent, Government Gardens in Mysore.
Comptroller to Government.

No. B. Dated 31.3.37

5331

31 MAR 1937

G.G 39-36-8

Office of the Superintendent,
Govt.Gardens, Lalbagh,
Bangalore, dated, 31st March 1937.

G.G.
1113
3813
31.3.37

From

M.Narayan Reddi, Esq., B.Sc.;(Edin).,
Superintendent,
Govt. Gardens, Lalbagh,
Bangalore.

To

The Chief Secretary to Govt. of His Highness
the Maharaja Of Mysore, Bangalore.

S i r,

With reference to your order No.D. 5836-37 G.G.39-36-7, I have the honour to state that I have investigated into the transactions of Arunachallam when he was in the saleroom.

Regarding the purchase of oranges and limes costing about Rs. 11-7-0 Arunachallam paid the amount as per pay order of the Superintendent. The fruits were purchased by the Superintendent and were never sent to the saleroom or propagater for seed purposes. Arunachallam alleges they were overripe fruits and unfit for consumption and only seeds from overripe fruits are used for sowing. If that is so why were the fruits not sent to the propagator immediately. I am of opinion that the fruits were purchased for the consumption of Mr. Seetharama Chetty and money was paid out from the saleroom. Arunachallam did not benefit in any way from this transaction.

Regards payment of Rs. 3/- for preparing

a bouquet the whole proceedure adopted by Arunachallam is illegal. There are no proper vouchers for the purchases made. Arunachallam says that this proceedure has been in vogue from a long time in the saleroom and he simply followed it. In any case the cost of the bouqet would never be more than one rupee and annas eight or two. The balance must be made good by him.

As to the supply of mango plants to Mr.Clarke the whole transaction was done by Mr.Seetharama Chetty himself. Arunachallam was simply carrying out the instructions of the Superintendent which he should not have done.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Narayan Re

Superintendent. 30.3.37

No. A. Dated 31.3.37

5332

31 MAR 1937

DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

Office of the Superintendent,
Govt. Gardens, Lalbagh,
Bangalore, dated, 31st March 1937.

G. G 39-36-9

From

M.Narayan Reddi, Esq., B.Sc.(Edin).,
Superintendent,
Govt. Gardens, Lalbagh,
Bangalore.

To

The Chief Secretary to Govt. of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

G.G. DMS 3813 31.3.37 30.3.37

Sir,

With reference to the Govt.Order No.D.5836-37 G.G.39-36-7 Ft.No.3450 dated 1-3-1937, I have the honou to submit my report regarding the shortages in the stoc of seed and destruction of the balance of seed by the saleroom staff. I will here briefly explain the proceedure adopted in the management of the saleroom. There are four officials working in the saleroom and their chief duties as per distribution statement are -

1. Salesman -

General management of saleroom and correspondence and accounts : maintenance of important registers.

2. Plant and Seed Clerk.

He is in charge of imported stock of flower and vegetable seeds : registering of plants and seed orders and arranging their despatch preparation of monthly outstanding list and issuing reminders

3. Attender -

Registering To and From : Maintenance of files : despatching : and stock book of packing materials.

4. Packer -

Collection of seeds in the garden ; packing plants and seeds.

Prior to the Chief Secretary's inspection the salesman was attending to work in the morning between 8 to 11 A.M. while the plant and seed Clerk from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. The usual hours prescribed are from 8 A.M. to 11 A.M. and from 2 P.M. to 5 P.M.

The seeds in question relate to the year 1935 when T.Subba Rao was salesman and I.D.Karunakaran and V.Ramachandra Rao were plant and seed Clerk in turn. The stock was checked in April 1936. There was a shortage of seed worth about Rs. 270/- and the balance of seed valued at about Rs. 400/- was in the saleroom. Subba Rao was then Supervisor at Nandi Hills. In June 1936 he was asked to explain the descrepancies in the stock of seed. He came down to Bangalore several times in this connection but he did not offer any explanation. It is then plans were laid with the help of the Superintendent to suppress the old register containing the details of 1935 stock of seeds and open a new register. This new register was actually written by Karunakaran and initialled by Subba Rao. To do away with all traces of stock of 1935 the balance of seed was taken out by Karunakaran from the saleroom with the ~~present~~ pretext of cleaning and was burnt down. Arunachallam was the salesman then and though he

was going on in the saleroom, he never reported the matter until he was questioned on the subject. He failed in his duty to keep in safe custody the balance of seed.

In this connection I have to state that there had been no proper control over the saleroom The saleroom was practically kept open throughout the day through the usual prescribed hours were 8 to 11 A.M. in the morning and 2 to 5 P.M. in the afternoon. The misappropriation of seeds had been going on year after year. No stock taking was done at the end of ever year and the responsibility fixed for the shortages. The Assistant Superintendent did not exercise any control over the saleroom though he was supposed to be in charge of it.

I have gone into the question of shortage of seed in the saleroom and examined in detail all the officials connected with the saleroom. I am of opinion that all these officials * are involved at one time or other in the shortage of seed noticed. Every one of them had a hand in pilfering of the seed and disposing them off to the nurserymen.

K.Subba Rao -

He was salesman from 1-8-1933 to 2-4-1936. He was morally responsible for the safe custody of seeds. In his statement he says that he was guided by Mr. Seetharama Chetty and he was compelled to initial the new register against his own conscience.

From the enquiry it struck me that Subba Rao was more a fool than a knave. ~~While~~ while he can not be absolved from all blame of loss of seeds, I am inclined to think that he did not personally benefit. I understand he has given in writing that he would make good the shortage of seed.

T.P.Arunachallam. -

He was in the saleroom from 24-8-36 to 21-12-36. He was responsible for the safe custody of the balance of seed which was destroyed. This loss to Government must be recovered from him. I am of opinion that both these officials played into the hands of Mr. Seetharama Chetty. They are unreliable and must not be kept in responsible posts. If it is possible they might be transfered to some other departments or if retained here they must be given lesser responsible posts.

T.D.Karunakaran -

He was plant and seed Clerk in the saleroom for several years till 7-9-1935. He is heavily indebted and there are a number of attachments against him. The shortages have occured during his period as plant and seed Clerk in the saleroom. He is responsible for writing up the new register and probably for the suppression of the old stock register. Karunakaran is the person who burnt the balance of seed of 1935. This official must be dismissed from service.

V.Ramachandra Rao -

He was plant and seed Clerk from Aug.1935 to April 1936. He took complete charge of seed books

books etc. from Karunakaran. He was in custody of seeds but he denies in his statement that he was given charge of the seed. There is evidence to show that he was given charge of the seed and that he was actually handling the seed in the saleroom. This is a deliberate lie. Like Karunakaran he is heavily indebted and there are several attachments pending against him. The shortages in stock of seed have occured during his time as Plant and seed Clerk. Ramachandra Rao is a temporary official in the department and I am of opinion that the services of this official must be dispensed with forthwith.

P.B.Subramhanyam

Since last three months he is Overseer in charge of Lalbagh. Prior to that he was working in the office as Accountant and for 5 or 6 years from 1931 to 1937 he was supposed to be an special duty checking the accounts of the various sections in the department. But he scrupulously omitted to check the accounts in the saleroom. On my questioning him he tells me that he was not asked to do so.

Subramhanyam is doing the seed business in the name of one Krishna Murthy, his nephew. He stated that he stopped this seed business eight years back. On my further questioning him he said that he closed the business two years back. I have evidence to show that he has supplied vegetable seeds to the Horticultural Farm in December 1935 in the name of one Venkatappa. As per instructions of the Farm Manager, Shamanna the Farm Assistant purchased from Subramhanyam vegetable seeds to the extent of Rs. 8/-. This amount was later actually adjusted against his dues to the farm. Subramhanyam was working in the saleroom off and on and his

his close association with Ramachandra Rao in the saleroom during the absence of Arunachallam salesman, is highly suspicious. Subramhanyam is systematically carrying on business in seed and even now he is supplying vegetable seeds and to kitchen gardeners round about Lalbagh and elsewhere. I have strong reasons to believe that he is also responsible for pilfering of seeds in the saleroom which has been going on.

There are several other allegations against Subramhanyam. I mention here only a few of them.

As Overseer in charge of Lalbagh he is misusing the labour. One or two persons are working in his house every day.

He had taken away his personal file from the office without the permission of the Manager. He had removed from the file about eight papers pertaining to his house building advance and subsequently returned them to the file on my questioning him. In this connection I have to mention that he got from the Government the house building advance of Rs. 1400/- only and the building constructed is valued at Rs.5000/- to Rs. 6000/-. I am told that he utilised the services of departmental labour and departmental Contractor Chennappa.

He was instrumental in preparing the gravel bill for Rs. 69/-. It was Subramhanyam who took Shamanna Farm Assistant to Seetharama Chetty and there induced him to sign the bill. The fact is that both Seetharama Chetty and Subramhanyam owed to the Farm to the extent of Rs. 69/- and odd and they wanted to see that their

their dues are somehow adjusted.

He is a terror in the office. No officer is dare enough to come forward and give evidence against him. Somehow he gets into confidence of either Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent and with their help he threatens the officials and makes use of them for his nefarious purpose. I have come to know that he is the person who writes anonymous petitions to Government. I am of strongly of opinion that this official is a dangerous person to be retained in service any longer and I strongly recommend that he may be retired from service forthwith.

Gundu Rao is no longer in the service of the department

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant.

Narayan Rao

Superintendent. 31.3.3

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section G.G

File No. 39-36

Serial No. 10

Diary No. of letter replied to..... Confidential No.

D.O. ToD 7034

The Hon'ble G.G.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

*the* *193*

Sri,

With reference to your letter nos. A 2 B dated 21 March 1937 submitting a report on the results of enquiry into the alleged shortages of seed in the Kalburgi Sale rooms, etc., I desired to represent connected am ~~directed~~ that the results of enquiry ~~into the said~~ case may be sent for perusal by Govt.

Y. S

~~Private Secy~~

16.4.37

Date of issue..... 22-4-37

Signed by ..... M. K. Subba Rao

List of enclosures.....

Copied by ..... 22/4

Examined by.....

Confidential

D. O. No. D 70.34/G.G.39-36-10

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Dated, Bangalore, 21st April 1937.
22nd

13

Dear Sir,

With reference to your letters Nos. A & dated 31st March 1937 submitting a report on the results of enquiry into the alleged short of seeds in the Lalbagh Sale room, etc., I am desired to request that the connected records of enquiry may be submitted for perusal by - Government.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) K. Subba Rao

Dr. L. C. Awasthi, M.Sc., Ph.D.,
Superintendent,
Government Gardens, Bangalore.

GOVERNMENT BOTANIC GARDENS,
LAL-BAGH, BANGALORE.

1st May, 1937.

Confidential
D.O. No. 5/37.

Dear Sir,

In continuation of my D.O. letter No. 3/37 dated 30th April, I wish to supplement the suggestions made by Mr. N. Reddi regarding P.B. Subramanyam, Overseer at Lalbagh. I agree with Mr. Reddi's suggestion that P.B. Subramanyam should be retired from Service. From my own observation he is inefficient as an overseer. Recently I issued an Office Order that all trees and shrubs either cut or tampered with should be reported to the Superintendent. P.B. Subramanyam has failed to comply; a tamarind tree near the fern house has been tampered with and the fruit taken away, since the issue of the order and no report was made. This is a violation of an office order. Further he has been given a chance to enquire into the matter and he has given me no satisfactory explanations. I learn from several sources that he took the tamarind berries to his house. As an overseer he has not been taking the attendance of pensionable and non-pensionable labour every day, nor has he checked the attendance. Further he has failed to affix his signature daily and I find that at the end of the month he has signed for all the previous days at one go, including the days when he was on leave. This he has done during the months of March and April. I have asked for an explanation which is yet to come. Subramanyam, as an overseer, does not know the programme of the work to be done for the day. He leaves this to the entire charge of the maistries. Neither is he as efficient or as prompt as other overseers in carrying out instructions given by me or the Asst. Superintendent.

I submit the above for your information.

Yours sincerely,

L.S. Dorasami
1/5

(L.S. Dorasami)
Offg. Superintendent.

K. Subba Rao, Esq.,
Asst. Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General & Revenue Secretariat,
Bangalore.

6045

GOVERNMENT BOTANIC GARDENS,
LAL-BAGH BANGALORE.

Dated 30th April 1937.

CONFIDENTIAL D.O. No. 3/37

Dear Sir,

With reference to your D.O. letter No. D.7034/G.G. 39-36-10 dated the 21st instant, I am enclosing the connected records of enquiry into the alleged shortage of seeds in the Lalbagh Sale Room.

Yours sincerely,

L. S. Dorasami
30/4

(L.S. Dorasami)
Offg. Supt.

K. Subba Rao, Esq., B.A.,
Asst. Secretary to Government
of Mysore,
General & Revenue Secretariat,
Bangalore.

Enclosures:-

Exhibit (1) B.S. Rangappa
" (2) B.S. Shamanna

P.T.O.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Exhibit | (3) | K. Subba Rao |
| " | (4) | I.D. Karunakaran |
| " | (5) | K. Venkata Reddy |
| " | (6) | V. Ramachandra Rao |
| " | (7) | P.B. Subramaniam |
| " | (8) | K. Subba Rao |
| " | (9) | K. Subba Rao |
| " | (10) | K. Subba Rao |
| " | (11) | T.P. Arunachalam |
| " | (12) | B.N. Sreenivasa Rao |

S. App. F VI—G 2]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

*Diary. No. of letter replied to* 6095

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

*the* *193*

Date of issue.....193 .

Signed by.....

May this be—

(i) printed?

(ii) treated as a standing order?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English Part?

(iv) translated?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press?

(vi) published in the Gazette, Kannada Part?

Confl.

**Section** G.G.

**File No.** 39-36

**Serial No.**

*Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

*Read*— G.O. no. D-58367 G.G. 39-36 dated 27-2-1937 directing that a fuller enquiry be made into the Conduct of certain offrs of Gardens Dept. in regard certain irregularities brought to notice during the course of Order thereon. ~~No.~~ inspection of the offs of the Dept. G.G. by the Chief Secretary to Govt.

Correspondence ending with Letter no. S. Bl-5/1937 from the Dept. G.G. Submitting the records of enquiry into the alleged shortage of seeds in the Lalbagh

with his own findings thereon

~~Room, and forwarding~~

~~Recommendations~~
~~action~~ in the matter.

Order.

In his G.O. dt 27.2.37, read above, the Supdt, G.G. was asked to hold a full enquiry into the Conduct of the following officials in regard to the alleged shortage of Stores in the Saleroom at Lallaguda and other Connected matters and submit a report of his findings for the orders of Govt.

(i) K. Subba Rao

(ii) V. Ramachandra Rao

(iii) T.P. Arunachalam

(iv) I.D. Karumakaran

(v) P.B. Subramaniyam and

(vi) D.K. Ezekiel Rao.

*List of Enclosure*

It is reported that D.K. Ezekiel Rao is no longer in the Service of the Govt. The Supdt. G.G. has submitted his report regarding the Extent of responsibility et

*Copied*

*Exami*

G. R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

*(Continuation sheet draft form.)*

96

of the ~~the~~ officials in the matter. Govt. have perused the records in this case and agree with the Suptdt. in regard to the conclusions arrived at by him bracketing the conduct of the above clerical staff of the ~~General offices~~ and executive subordinates of the Gardens Dept. ~~accordingly~~. The records show how demoralised the staff had become in the Lalbagh and how Govt. money was being made a source of profit by the smaller officials for the lack of honesty in the head of the dept. (Mr. Sterling) and the total absence of check in the day to day execution of works. Such irregularities as are likely to repeat themselves unless the Suptdt. exercises

of [ ] may remain

undermining vigilance and checks not merely the accidents but also the facts on which the accounts are based.

Govt: are pleased to pass orders as follows against the several officials:-

(1) K. Subba Rao:- He will be reduced from his present pay Rs: 505/- to Rs: 445/- p.m. for a period of one year.

2 He should also make good the sum Rs: 270/- or such other sum which actually represents the shortage in the accounts of the Seed Depot.

) V. Ramachandra Rao. This offr: has proved himself to be unreliable and is besides reported to be heavily indebted. His services may be dispensed with.

) T-D. Karunakaran. Govt: are convinced that this offr: is an arch culprit. He had the

3. It is reported that D.K. Ramaiah has no longer in the service of the Dept. With regard to the remaining officers Govt are pleased to pass orders as follows:

The shortage, if such occurred during the period he was the salesman. There is no doubt about his responsibility - his signature Subject to appeal - he is though based on the assessment that notwithstanding and against the personally be required to it.

He does not hold any substantive appointment in the Dept

G. R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

in the ~~Sale room~~ Saleroom

While the enquiry against Mr. Sellathurai was in progress. He seems to have had a hand in suppressing the genuine Stock register of the Saleroom and substituting a spurious one which is in his own handwriting

and also by destroying

The seeds ~~belonging to Govt.~~ entrusted to his charge

Secrecy ~~of enquiry~~ was

in ~~favour~~ of his servant

[iv] T. P. Arunachalam. Thus

Conduct of this officer is not above suspicion

It seems to have been ~~and Govt. are of opinion~~

that he should be more vigilant and reliable, his removal and destruction of the seeds might have been prevented

They direct that his pay be reduced by Rs. 10/- one year and that he be a less responsible

He should also pay Rs. 200/- ~~out of~~ as a portion of representing the value of the seeds destroyed.

This official is reported to be
~~getting a separate~~ to the Cannop area quarterly
~~accounts~~ It is understood
he is surreptitiously carrying on
that ~~this official~~ on the
business of selling seeds in
the name of ~~his~~ Government and
that there is a strong suspicion
that many of the seeds pilfered
from the Lydbrook Seed Room
found
~~first~~ their way into his hands. The
Supdt. gives an instance of the
sale of vegetable seeds worth Rs. 8/- by
the ~~L~~ Govt. Horti. Farm and the adjustment
of this amount against subscriptions
due to this Farm. There are also other
allegations ~~against him~~ of his misuse
of departmental labour and
material by him. These allegations are all
of a serious nature justifying a severe
punishment. But in view of his advanced
age and the length of service put in by him,
Govt. are pleased to direct that he be retired from service
~~forthwith~~ forthwith compulsorily.

4. Govt. trust that the punishment

G. R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

*(Continuation sheet draft form.)*

ordered above will prove a sufficient deterrent to the erring officials in the Dept. and work the rules in consequence with Dept. will improve and be maintained at ~~with a high state of efficiency~~ a high level in future ~~as before~~.

Ch. Secy.

27.5.37

To

The Supdt. G. G.

Compt.

Confidential.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF
H.H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

3 Copies

Read-

G.O. No D.5836-7/G.G.39-36-7 dated 27th February 1937 directing that a fuller enquiry be made into the conduct of certain officials of the Gardens Department in regard to certain irregularities brought to notice during the course of inspection of the office of the Superintendent, Government Gardens, by the Chief Secretary to Govt.

Correspondence ending with letter No. 5 dated 1st May 1937 from the Superintendent Government Gardens, submitting the records of enquiry into the alleged shortage of seeds in the Lalbagh sale-room, with his own findings thereon.

....

Order No. D 8040-41/G.G.39-36-12

In the G.O. dated 27th February 1937 (31-5-37) read above, the Superintendent, G.G. was asked to hold a full enquiry into the conduct of the following officials (and Ex-Ve Subordinates in trade) in regard to the alleged shortage and destructic of seeds in the sale-room at Lalbagh and other cognate matters and submit a report o: his findings for the orders of Government:

(i) K. Subba Rao
(ii) V. Ramachandra Rao
(iii) T.P. Arunachalam
(iv) T.D. Karunakaran
(v) P.B. Subrahmanyam and
(vi) D.K. Gundu Rao

2. Government have perused the records in this case and agree with the Supt. in regard to the conclusions arrived at by him touching the conduct of the above clerical staff and executive subordinates of the Gardens Department. The records show how demoralised the staff had become in Lalbagh and how Govt. property was being made a source of profit by the smaller officials for lack of ~~honesty~~ with firm in the Head of the Dept. (Mr.Seetha-rama ~~Setty~~ Chetty) and the total absence of check in the day to day execution of works. Such irregularities are likely to repeat themselve unless the Superintendent exercises unremitting vigilance and checks not merely the accounts but also the facts on which the accounts are based.

3. It is reported that D.K.Gundu Rao is no longer in the service of the Departmen With regard to the remaining officials, Govt. are pleased to pass orders as follows:

(i) K. Subba Rao: The shortage of seeds occurred during the period he was the salesman. There is no doubt about his responsibility for the shortage though it is stated that he did not personally benefit by it. He ~~will be~~ is reduced from his present pay of Rs.55 to Rs.45 p.m. for a period of one year. He should also make good the sum of Rs.270 or such other sum which actually re presents the shortage in the accounts of the Seed Depot.

Subject to approval for orders the reduction is permanent

No. 607 Memo, dt. 18/5/62. Reduction is for one year.

(ii) V. Ramachandra Rao: This official has proved himself to be unreliable and is besides reported to be heavily indebted. He does not hold any substantive appointment in the Department. His services may be dispensed with.

(iii) I.D. Karunakaran: Government consider that this official is ~~an arch culprit~~ responsible for a good deal of the malpractices pursued in the Sale-Room. He had ~~Had~~ the audacity to destroy the seeds in the sale-room while the enquiry against Mr. Seetharamapetty was in progress. He seems to have had a hand in suppressing the genuine stock register of the sale-room and substituting a spurious one which is in his own hand-writing. His services may be dispensed with.

(iv) T.P. Arunachallam: The conduct of this official is not above suspicion and it seems to Government that had he been more vigilant and reliable, the removal and destruction of the seeds might have been prevented. They direct that his pay be reduced by Rs.10 p.m. for one year and that he be posted to a less responsible work. He should also make good Rs.200 representing a portion of the value of the seeds destroyed.

(v) P.B. Subrahmanyam: ~~This official is reported to be both cunning and~~ This official is reported to be both ~~cunning and~~ mischievous and